PB-245 153

OXIDATION OF HALOCARBONS

J. P. Keicklen, et al

Pennsylvania State University

Prepared for:

National Environmental Research Center

May 1975

DISTRIBUTED BY:

NTIS

National Technical Information Service
U. S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

276058

PB 245 153

EPA-650/3-75-008

May 1975

Ecological Research Series

Reproduced by
NATIONAL TECHNICAL
INFORMATION SERVICE
US Department of Commerce
Springfield, VA. 22151

TECHNICAL REPORT DATA
(Please read Instructions on the reverse before completing)

1. REPORT NO.	2.	3. RECIPIENT'S ACCESSION NO.
EPA-650/3-75-008		

4. TITLE AND SUBTITLE	5. REPORT DATE
The Oxidation of Halocarbons	May 1975 (date of approval)
	6. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION CODE

7. AUTHOR(S)	8. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION REPORT NO.
J. P. Heicklen, E. Sanhueza, I. C. Hisatsune, R. K. M. Jayanty, R. Simonaitis, L. A. Hull, C. W. Blume, and E. Mathias	

9. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME AND ADDRESS	10. PROGRAM ELEMENT NO.
Center for Air Environment Studies 226 Fenske Lab. The Pennsylvania State University University Park, Pa., 16802	1A1008, ROAP 26AAD-20
	11. CONTRACT/GRANT NO.
	Grant No. 800949

12. SPONSORING AGENCY NAME AND ADDRESS	13. TYPE OF REPORT AND PERIOD COVERED
Environmental Protection Agency Research Triangle Park, N. C., 27711	Final Report-6/1/72-5/31/74
	14. SPONSORING AGENCY CODE

15. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES

Presented before the Division of Environmental Chemistry, American Chemical Society April 9, 1975, 169th National Meeting, Philadelphia, Pa.

16. ABSTRACT

The gas-phase room-temperature oxidation of haloethylenes was studied. In general oxidation has been carried out in five ways: 1) chlorine atom initiation, 2) Hg $6(^3P)$ sensitization, 3) reaction with $O(^3P)$, 4) reaction with $O(^3P)$ in the presence of O_2, and 5) reaction with O_3. In the first four systems the major products are the corresponding carbonyl chlorides containing 1 or 2 carbon atoms, and the reaction proceeds by a long-chain free radical process. With O_3 a diradical chain is involved which is inhibited by O_2.

Free radical attack of CH_2Cl_2 or CH_3Cl in the presence of O_2 gives carbonyl halides, as does the photolysis of CCl_4, CCl_3F, and CCl_2F_2 in the presence of O_2 or O_3. CCl_4 and the chlorofluoromethanes react with $O(^1D)$ via chlorine atom abstraction in reactions with large rate coefficients which are nearly proportional to the number of chlorine atoms in the chlorofluoromethane.

17. KEY WORDS AND DOCUMENT ANALYSIS

a. DESCRIPTORS	b. IDENTIFIERS/OPEN ENDED TERMS	c. COSATI Field/Group
Halocarbons Photochemistry Radical Reactions Gas Phase Kinetics Spectroscopic Identification		

18. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT	19. SECURITY CLASS (This Report)	21. NO. OF PAGES
Release Unlimited	Unclassified	153
	20. SECURITY CLASS (This page)	22. PRICE
	Unclassified	6.25

EPA Form 2220-1 (9-73)

1a

EPA-650/3-75-008

OXIDATION OF HALOCARBONS

by

J. P. Heicklen, E. Sanhueza, I. C. Hisatsune,
R. K. M. Jayanty, R. Simonaitis, L. A. Hull,
C. W. Blume, and E. Mathias

Center for Air Environment Studies
Pennsylvania State University
University Park, Pennsylvania 16802

Grant No. 800949
ROAP No. 26AAD-20
Program Element No. 1A1008

EPA Project Officer: Dr. Joseph Bufalini

Chemistry and Physics Laboratory
National Environmental Research Center
Research Triangle Park, North Carolina 27711

Prepared for

U. S. ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY
OFFICE OF RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT
WASHINGTON, D. C. 20460

May 1975

EPA REVIEW NOTICE

This report has been reviewed by the National Environmental Research Center - Research Triangle Park, Office of Research and Development, EPA, and approved for publication. Approval does not signify that the contents necessarily reflect the views and policies of the Environmental Protection Agency, nor does mention of trade names or commercial products constitute endorsement or recommendation for use.

RESEARCH REPORTING SERIES

Research reports of the Office of Research and Development, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, have been grouped into series. These broad categories were established to facilitate further development and application of environmental technology. Elimination of traditional grouping was consciously planned to foster technology transfer and maximum interface in related fields. These series are:

1. ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH EFFECTS RESEARCH
2. ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION TECHNOLOGY
3. ECOLOGICAL RESEARCH
4. ENVIRONMENTAL MONITORING
5. SOCIOECONOMIC ENVIRONMENTAL STUDIES
6. SCIENTIFIC AND TECHNICAL ASSESSMENT REPORTS
9. MISCELLANEOUS

This report has been assigned to the ECOLOGICAL RESEARCH series. This series describes research on the effects of pollution on humans, plant and animal species, and materials. Problems are assessed for their long- and short-term influences. Investigations include formation, transport, and pathway studies to determine the fate of pollutants and their effects. This work provides the technical basis for setting standards to minimize undesirable changes in living organisms in the aquatic, terrestrial, and atmospheric environments.

This document is available to the public for sale through the National Technical Information Service, Springfield, Virginia 22161.

Publication No. EPA-650/3-75-008

ABSTRACT

The gas-phase room-temperature oxidation of haloethylenes is reviewed. In general oxidation has been carried out in five ways: 1) chlorine atom initiation, 2) Hg $6(^3P)$ sensitization, 3) reaction with $O(^3P)$, 4) reaction with $O(^3P)$ in the presence of O_2, and 5) reaction with O_3.

The chlorine-atom initiated oxidation of CCl_2CCl_2, $CHClCCl_2$, CH_2CCl_2, cis-$CHClCHCl$, trans-$CHClCHCl$, CF_2CCl_2, $CFClCFCl$ (mixed cis and trans), CF_2CFCl, and C_2F_4 proceed by a long chain free radical process. The major products are the corresponding carbonyl chlorides containing 1 or 2 carbon atoms. By contrast there is no chain process in $CHClCH_2$. For most of the chloroethylenes, the chain length of the reaction exceeds 100 at sufficiently high O_2 pressures, and is independent of the absorbed light intensity, I_a, or any of the reactant pressures.

The general mechanism of the long chain oxidation is (X = H, F, or Cl)

$$Cl + CX_2CXCl \rightarrow ClCX_2CXCl \qquad 2a$$

$$\rightarrow CX_2CXCl_2 \qquad 2b$$

$$ClCX_2CXCl + O_2 \rightarrow ClCX_2CXClO_2 \qquad 3$$

$$CX_2CXCl_2 + O_2 \rightarrow CXCl_2CX_2O_2 \qquad 3'$$

$$2ClCX_2CXClO_2 \rightarrow 2ClCX_2CXClO + O_2 \qquad 4a$$

$$\rightarrow (ClCX_2CXClO)_2 + O_2 \qquad 4b$$

$$2CXCl_2CX_2O_2 \rightarrow 2CXCl_2CX_2O + O_2 \qquad 4a'$$

$$\rightarrow (CXCl_2CX_2O)_2 + O_2 \qquad 4b'$$

$$ClCX_2CXClO_2 + ClCX_2CXCl \rightarrow (ClCX_2CX_2ClO)_2 \qquad 5$$

$$ClCX_2CXClO \rightarrow ClCX_2CX(O) + Cl \qquad 6a$$

$$\rightarrow CXClO + ClCX_2 \qquad 6b$$

$$CXCl_2CX_2O \rightarrow CXCl_2CX(O) + X \qquad 6a'$$

$$\rightarrow CXCl_2 + CX_2O \qquad 6b'$$

$$ClCX_2 + O_2 \rightarrow CX_2O + Cl + (1/2)O_2 \qquad 7a$$

The chlorine atom attaches preferentially to the less chlorinated carbon atom of the chloroethylene. A long chain oxidation (>150) occurs when the exothermicity of either reaction 6a or 6b is greater than 11 kcal/mole. For an exothermicity of 11 kcal/mole, a shorter chain length (≃20) is involved. In $CHClCH_2$, the radical produced is $CH_2ClCHClO$, the exothermicity of decay of this radical by any route is <11 kcal/mole, and the favored decay route is by C-C bond cleavage which produces the terminating radical CH_2Cl. The ejection of an H atom from $CClX_2CXHO$ was never observed; decay of $CClX_2CH_2O$ by any route was not observed.

The Hg $6(^3P)$ sensitized oxidation of chloroethylenes leads to the same free-radical long-chain process as observed with chlorine-atom initiation. However the chain lengths are shorter and are proportional to the olefin pressure in the Hg $6(^3P)$ system. Furthermore CO is always a product of the reaction. Thus the initiating and terminating steps are different in the two systems.

For the chlorinated ethylenes, the Hg $6(^3P)$ system was studied for C_2Cl_4, C_2Cl_3H, and CCl_2CH_2, only. It was proposed that C_2X_2Cl radicals are produced. These radicals can add O_2. The suggested initiation reaction was:

$$C_2X_2ClO_2 + CX_2CCl_2 \rightarrow C_2X_2Cl_3 + (CXO)_2$$

The CO production could be associated with the termination step which is not well understood. The overall reaction suggested was:

$$C_2X_2ClO_2 \rightarrow CO \text{ via termination}$$

When $O(^3P)$ reacts with haloethylenes, carbon-carbon double bond cleavage can occur

$$O(^3P) + C_2X_4 \rightarrow CX_2 + CX_2O \text{ (or } CO + X_2)$$

the reaction can proceed through an excited intermediate

$$O(^3P) + C_2X_4 \rightarrow CX_2CX_2O^*$$

or rearrangement, possibly followed by fragmentation, can occur

$$O(^3P) + C_2X_4 \rightarrow CX_3CXO \text{ (or } CX_3 + XCO)$$

For the haloethylenes studied, the relative importance of the three processes are:

Haloethylene	C=C Cleavage	Excited Molecule	Rearrangement
CCl_2CCl_2	0.19	0.81	0
CCl_2CClH	0.23	0.77	0
CCl_2CH_2	0.31	0.55	0.14
cis-CHClCHCl	0.23	0.73-0.77	$\leq$0.04
trans-CHClCHCl	0.28	0.68-0.72	$\leq$0.04
$CClHCH_2$	$\leq$0.25	>0.30	0.09-0.34
CF_2CF_2	0.85	0.15	0
CFClCFCl (cis & trans)	0.80	0.20	0
CF_2CCl_2	0	1.00	0

In the presence of O_2, the diradical fragment produced along with the carbonyl compound containing one carbon can oxidize to initiate the long chain mono-free-radical process observed by either chlorine atom initiation or Hg 6(^{3}P) sensitization. If the diradical contains a chlorine atom, the initiation step is

$$CXCl + O_2 \rightarrow XO + ClCO$$

The chain length of the oxidation depends on the parameter $[CClXCX_2]/I_a^{1/2}$, thus indicating additional radical-radical terminating steps.

The ozonolysis of haloethylenes proceeds by an entirely different route than the above-mentioned oxidations. It is a chain oxidation, carried by a diradical mechanism, which is inhibited in the presence of O_2. The

reaction rate law is first-order in both $[O_3]$ and $[CX_2CX_2]$ at high reactant pressures, but at low pressures the rate drops off faster than extrapolated, and the rate law changes in a complex way. However in all cases the major products of the reaction are the corresponding 1- and 2-carbon carbonyl products. For the less-substituted chloroethylenes, the carbonyl products containing one carbon atom are the major, if not exclusive, products.

The mechanism of the ozonolysis is complex and several paths may be involved. The most often invoked mechanism starts with the cleavage of the double bond.

$$C_2X_4 + O_3 \rightarrow CX_2O + CX_2O_2$$

This reaction proceeds through the molozonide as an intermediate and occurs in C_2H_4 and the higher hydrocarbon olefins as well as in CH_2CHCl. However there is considerable evidence to suggest that either in addition to or in place of the above reaction, the initiation can occur via

$$C_2X_4 + O_3 \rightleftarrows C_2X_4O_3 \qquad 107$$

$$C_2X_4O_3 + C_2X_4 \rightleftarrows C_4X_8O_3 \qquad 108$$

$$C_4X_8O_3 + O_3 \rightarrow 2CX_2O + 2CX_2O_2 \qquad 109$$

The $C_2X_4O_3$ intermediate is probably the π-complex. The route consisting of reactions 107-109 is the dominant, if not exclusive route, to ozonolysis in $CHClCHCl$, CH_2CCl_2, and CCl_2CCl_2. With either initiating mechanism, the CX_2O_2 species carries the chain.

The chlorine-atom sensitized oxidation of CH_2Cl_2 gives $CHClO$ and CCl_2O as products with respective quantum yields of 49 and 4.1 independent of reaction conditions at 32°C. For the Cl-CH_3Cl system the initial products are HCl and $CHClO$, the quantum yield of the latter being 2.0 under all conditions. Thus $CHCl_2$ reacts with O_2 similarly to CCl_3, whereas CH_2Cl

reacts with O_2 simlarly to CH_3, (except that no alcohol is produced). In both systems the CHClO is removed by chlorine atoms in an hydrogen abstraction reaction with a rate coefficient of 7×10^8 $\underline{M}^{-1}$ sec^{-1} at 32°C.

The photolysis of CCl_4 at 213.9 nm is interpreted in terms of an excited molecule mechanism which proceeds entirely by

$$CCl_4^* \rightarrow CCl_2 \text{ (singlet)} + Cl_2$$

at low pressures. At higher pressures CCl_4^* is quenched and CCl_2 production is inhibited, though it may be (and probably is) replaced by production of $CCl_3 + Cl$. For $CFCl_3$ and CF_2Cl_2 photolysis at 213.9 nm, the main, and probably exclusive, process is chlorine atom ejection

$$CFCl_3 \text{ (or } CF_2Cl_2) + h\nu \text{ (213.9 nm)} \rightarrow Cl + CFCl_2 \text{ (or } CF_2Cl)$$

The reaction of $O(^1D)$ with the perhalomethanes leads mainly, if not exclusively, to chlorine atom abstraction

$$O(^1D) + CF_nCl_{4-n} \ (n = 0\text{-}3) \rightarrow ClO + CF_nCl_{3-n}$$

The rate coefficients for these reactions, relative to that for N_2O ($k = 2.2 \times 10^{-10}$ cm^3/sec) are

molecule	CCl_4	$CFCl_3$	CF_2Cl_2	CF_3Cl
relative k	2.1	1.5	1.2	0.52

This report was submitted in fulfillment of E.P.A. Grant No. R 800949 under the major sponsorship of the Environmental Protection Agency. Work was completed as of February, 1975.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

ABSTRACT. iii

LIST OF FIGURES xi

LIST OF TABLES. xiii

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS xiv

CONCLUSIONS xv

RECOMMENDATIONS xviii

INTRODUCTION. 1

I. CHLOROETHYLENE OXIDATION. 2

Experimental. 2

Photochemical Experiments 2

Materials 2

Procedure 3

Ozone Experiments. 5

Cl-Atom Initiated Oxidation 7

Vinyl Chloride 16

O_3 Present 19

F_2-Initiated Oxidation 21

Hg $6(^3P)$ Sensitized Oxidation 21

O_2 Absent. 23

O_2 Present 24

Reaction with $O(^3P)$ Atoms 29

Individual Substituted Ethylenes 30

CCl_2CCl_2. 30

CCl_2CHCl. 31

CCl_2CH_2 31

Page

cis- and trans-$CHClCHCl$ 33

$CHClCH_2$ 34

CH_2CH_2 35

CH_2CHBr 36

CF_2CF_2 36

$C_2F_nH_{4-n}$ (n = 1, 2 and 3) 36

$CFClCFCl$ 39

CF_2CCl_2 39

CF_2CFCl 40

Mechanism. 40

Rate Coefficient 43

Reaction with $O(^3P)$ in the Presence of O_2 46

Methylene Oxidation. 48

Oxidation of $CX_2CX_2O^*$. 49

Individual Molecules 49

C_2Cl_4 49

$CHClCCl_2$. 50

$CHClCHCl$. 50

CH_2CCl_2 50

$CFClCFCl$. 50

CF_2CCl_2 50

C_2F_4. 51

$CHClCH_2$ 52

Rate Law 53

Reactions with Ozone. 54

Review of the Experimental Data. 56

Page

C_2H_4 56

C_2F_4 65

C_2Cl_4 66

$CHClCCl_2$. 69

CH_2CCl_2 69

$CHClCHCl$. 70

$CHClCH_2$ 77

Review of Ozonolysis Mechanism 83

C_2H_4. 83

C_2F_4. 91

C_2Cl_4 92

CH_2CCl_2 95

$CHClCHCl$. 97

Discussion 100

II. OXIDATION OF CHLOROMETHANES. 108

Experimental. 108

Photooxidation of the Perhalomethanes 110

Photolysis of CCl_4 110

Photolysis of $CFCl_3$. 116

Photolysis of CF_2Cl_2 119

Reaction with $O(^1D)$ Atoms 120

Chlorine-Atom Sensitized Oxidation of CH_2Cl_2 and CH_3Cl. 122

REFERENCES. 125

LIST OF PUBLICATIONS. 132

LIST OF FIGURES

Page

Fig. 1 Log-log plot of $\Phi\{CH_2ClCCl(O)\}$ vs. $[O_2]/[Cl_2]$ in the chlorine-atom initiated oxidation of C_2H_3Cl at 31°C. From Sanhueza and Heicklen (8) with permission of the American Chemical Society. . . . 18

Fig. 2 Log-log plot of the ratio of the quantum yields of $CCl_3CCl(O)$ and CCl_2O vs. $[O_3]/[O_2]$ in the chlorine-atom sensitized oxidation of C_2Cl_4 by O_2 and O_3 at 32°C. From Mathias et al (5) with permission of the National Research Council of Canada. 20

Fig. 3 Plot of $(\Phi\{CCl_3CCl(O)\} + (1/2)\Phi\{CCl_2O\})/\Phi\{\overline{CCl_2CCl_2O}\}$ vs. $[C_2Cl_4]/[O_3]$ in the chlorine-atom sensitized oxidation of C_2Cl_4 by O_2 and O_3 at 32°C. From Mathias et al (5) with permission of the National Research Council of Canada 22

Fig. 4 Infrared spectra of primary and secondary ethylene ozonides at liquid nitrogen temperature. In part from Hull et al (88) 61

Fig. 5 Microwave structure of secondary ethylene ozonide. From data of Gillies and Kuczkowski (85, 86). 64

Fig. 6 Time dependence of the composition of C_2Cl_4 ozonolysis reaction at 24°C: $[C_2Cl_4]_0 = 6.9$ Torr, $[O_3]_0 = 4.1$ Torr. From Mathias et al (5) with permission of the National Research Council of Canada 68

Fig. 7 Fourth order kinetic plot of trans-CHClCHCl reaction with ozone at 23°C. From Blume et al (71). 74

Fig. 8 First order kinetic plot of cis-CHClCHCl reaction with ozone at 23°C in N_2 buffer. From Blume et al (71). 75

Page

Fig. 9 First order kinetic plot of cis-CHClCHCl reaction with ozone at 23°C in O_2 buffer. From Blume et al (71). 76

Fig. 10 Ozone catalyzed isomerization of cis-CHClCHCl at 23°C. From Blume et al (71). 79

Fig. 11 First order kinetic plot from the isomerization data for the cis-CHClCHCl reaction at 23°C with O_2 buffer. From Blume et al (71). 80

Fig. 12 Infrared spectrum of vinyl chloride primary ozonide at liquid nitrogen temperature. The absorption bands identified by arrows are assigned to the more stable isomer of the ozonide. The weak band at 1755 cm^{-1} is due to formyl chloride residue still in the ozonide sample. From Hisatsune et al (92) 82

Fig. 13 Second order kinetic plot of vinyl chloride reaction with ozone at 22°C. From Kolopajlo (94) 84

Fig. 14 Plot of $\Phi\{COCl_2\}$ vs $[N_2]$ or $[O_2]$ for CCl_4 photolysis at 213.9 nm in the presence of O_2 or O_3 at 25°C. O $[CCl_4] \sim 10$ Torr in the presence of O_2, Δ $[CCl_4] \sim 10$ Torr in the presence of O_3, ● $[CCl_4] \sim 50$ Torr in the presence of O_2, ▲ $[CCl_4] \sim 50$ Torr in the presence of O_3. All analyses by gas chromatography. From Jayanty et al (111). 111

LIST OF TABLES

		Page
Table I	The chlorine-atom sensitized oxidation of $C_2Cl_{4-n}H_n$ and $C_2Cl_{4-n}F_n$.	8
Table II	Bond energies (kcal/mole) in chloroethoxy radicals	13
Table III	Rate coefficient ratios from the Hg 6(^{3}P) sensitized oxidation of chloroethylenes at 30-32°C.	28
Table IV	Oxidation of $CClHCCl_2$.	32
Table V	Products and quantum yields in the reaction of O(^{3}P) with chloro-, chlorofluoro-, and fluoroethylenes.	38
Table VI	Rate coefficient for the reaction of atomic oxygen with haloethylenes at room temperature.	44
Table VII	Relative reactivities of chloro- and chlorofluoroethylenes with atom and radicals in the gas phase at room temperature.	47
Table VIII	The reaction of chloroethylenes with O(^{3}P) in the presence of O_2.	55
Table IX	Kinetics of ethylene-ozone reaction in the presence of excess O_2.	60
Table X	Infrared spectra of primary and secondary ethylene ozonide	62
Table XI	Kinetic data for the ozonolysis of 1,2-dichloroethylene (DCE).	78
Table XII	Second order rate constants for the reactions of ozone with haloethylenes in CCl_4 solution at 25°C.	94
Table XIII	Elementary rate constants in the mechanism of ozonolysis of 1,1-dichloroethylene at 25°C	98
Table XIV	Elementary rate constants in the mechanism of ozonolysis of 1,2-dichloroethylene at 23°C	101
Table XV	Summary of measured and literature values of the rate coefficient for O(^{1}D) reactions, k{X}, relative to that for N_2O, k{N_2O}	123

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

The work reported herein which was done in our laboratory was done with financial support from the Environmental Protection Agency under Grant No. R800949 and the Center for Air Environment Studies at Penn State. Partial support for the studies on the perhalomethanes was provided by the National Aeronautics and Space Administration through Grant No. NGL-009-003 and the Atmospheric Sciences Section of the National Science Foundation through Grant No. GA-42856.

CONCLUSIONS

Chloroethylenes oxidize by free radical attack to give one and two carbon carbonyl compounds and chlorine atoms. Consequently when chloroolefins are in the atmosphere they will generate chlorine atoms and oxidize in a chain process. The carbonyl compounds are toxic and may hydrolyze to give HCl, particularly in the respiratory tract. In addition HClCO decomposes in the absence of H_2O to give HCl + CO and reacts with chlorine atoms with a rate coefficient of 7×10^8 $\underline{M}^{-1}$ sec^{-1} at 32°C.

The chloroethylenes are attacked by $O(^3P)$ atoms at a rate 0.1-1 that of $O(^3P)$ attack on C_2H_4. There are two paths of importance. Most of the time for the non-fluorinated chloroethylenes, the reaction produces an excited adduct which may or may not react further in the chain process.

$$O(^3P) + C_2X_4 \rightarrow CX_2CX_2O^*$$

For the non-fluorinated chloroethylenes, double-bond cleavage occurs 19-31% of the time

$$O(^3P) + C_2X_4 \rightarrow CX_2O + CX_2$$

The CX_2 diradical, which presumably is a triplet, can then react with O_2 to generate mono-free radicals. For the fluorinated chloroethylenes, the relative importance of the two processes is reversed. With CCl_2CH_2, $CClHCH_2$, and possibly cis- and trans-CHClCHCl, rearrangement occurs as a minor process.

$$O(^3P) + CX_2CX_2 \rightarrow CX_3CXO \text{ (or } CX_3 + XCO)$$

The reactions of O_3 with C_2Cl_4, CCl_2CH_2, cis- and trans-CHClCHCl, and $CHClCH_2$ are not important in the atmosphere for two reasons: 1) These reactions proceed by a long-chain diradical process in the absence of O_2, but O_2 inhibits the chain and greatly reduces the rate of reaction. 2) In the Torr range, the reactions proceed with a rate law which is

first-order in each reactant. However at lower pressures, the reactions become second-order in chloroethylene concentration (and in some cases also O_3 concentration). Even in the regime first order in both reactant concentrations, the rate coefficient is smaller than for the O_3-C_2H_4 reaction. With $CHClCH_2$ our preliminary studies, done in the Torr range, have not shown any deviation from the rate law first-order in each reactant, but the rate coefficient in the presence of O_2 of 3.9 $\underline{M}^{-1}$ sec^{-1} is too small for this reaction to be of any importance, even if the rate law is not modified at lower pressures.

The perhalomethanes are not chemically active in the troposphere. However in the lower stratosphere they can be removed by at least two processes: photooxidation and $O(^1D)$ atom attack. The photooxidation of $CFCl_3$ and CF_2Cl_2 at 213.9 nm proceeds mainly, if not entirely, by chlorine-atom ejection

$$CFCl_3 \text{ (or } CF_2Cl_2) + h\nu \text{ (213.9 nm)} \rightarrow Cl + CFCl_2 \text{ (or } CF_2Cl)$$

With CCl_4, however, the principal process expected for stratospheric pressures is molecular chlorine elimination at 213.9 nm

$$CCl_4 + h\nu \text{ (213.9 nm)} \rightarrow CCl_2 \text{ (singlet)} + Cl_2$$

The singlet CCl_2 produced reacted with CCl_4 in our laboratory experiments, but its fate in the stratosphere is not known. Probably it would react with O_3 to give $CCl_2O + O_2$ (singlet). At longer wavelengths, however, (e.g. 253.7 nm) the photodissociation products may be $CCl_3 + Cl$ in the stratosphere, since these are the higher-pressure products at longer wavelengths (120).

The reaction of $O(^1D)$ with the perhalomethanes is rapid and proceeds mainly, if not entirely, by chlorine-atom abstraction

$$CF_nCl_{4-n} \text{ (n = 0-3)} + O(^1D) \rightarrow CF_nCl_{3-n} + ClO$$

The room temperature rate coefficients for these reactions, relative to that for N_2O ($k = 2.2 \times 10^{-10}$ cm^3/sec) are

Molecule	CCl_4	$CFCl_3$	CF_2Cl_2	CF_3Cl
Relative k	2.1	1.5	1.2	0.52

The lifetimes for removal of the perhalomethanes in the stratosphere by the two processes are given below at various altitudes.

Alt., km	$[O(^1D)]$,[a] molec/cc	CCl_4 $\tau\{O(^1D)\}$,[b] yr	$CFCl_3$ $\tau\{Phot\}$,[c] yr	$CFCl_3$ $\tau\{O(^1D)\}$,[b] yr	CF_2Cl_2 $\tau\{Phot\}$,[c] yr	CF_2Cl_2 $\tau\{O(^1D)\}$,[b] yr	CF_3Cl $\tau\{O(^1D)\}$,[c] yr
20	0.25	274	6.60	384	63.4	480	1108
25	1.5	45.7	0.647	64.0	5.28	80.0	185
30	7.5	9.15	0.117	12.8	0.99	16.0	36.9
35	25	2.74	0.032	3.84	0.26	4.80	11.1
40	87.5	0.78	0.014	1.10	0.106	1.37	3.17
45	175	0.39	0.008	0.55	0.063	0.69	1.58
50	150	0.46	0.006	0.64	0.045	0.80	1.85

a) Average global yearly value.

b) Lifetime for removal by $O(^1D)$.

c) Reciprocal of the global average photodissociation coefficients given by F. S. Rowland and M. J. Molina, Atomic Energy Commission Report No. 1974-1 (1974) "Chlorofluoromethanes in the Environment."

$CFCl_3$, which does not absorb strongly radiation >2000Å is removed mainly by $O(^1D)$ atom attack, probably predominantly at 45 km. The other three chlorinated methanes are removed principally by photodissociation but removal of CF_2Cl_2 by $O(^1D)$ at 25-45 km makes a significant contribution.

RECOMMENDATIONS

In terms of problems of significance in urban atmospheres the following studies need to be done:

1) The reactions of Cl, $O(^3P)$, and HO with the haloethanes in the presence of O_2 should be studied.

2) For the molecules already studied, i.e. the chloroethylenes and the halomethanes, the reactions with HO radicals in the presence of O_2 should be examined. The products and mechanism of the reactions should be determined and the rate coefficients obtained.

3) The fate of the halogenated one- and two-carbon atom carbonyl compounds in the atmosphere should be determined. Their reactions with Cl, $O(^3P)$, HO, H_2O, H_2O_2, and NH_3 should be studied.

4) Computer modelling should be done to determine the influence of Cl atoms on photochemical smog.

In terms of problems of significance in the stratosphere, the photooxidation of the chloroalkanes and the carbonyl compounds should be examined. Also more detailed wavelength studies should be made with CCl_4 to determine its primary process as a function of wavelength under stratospheric condtions.

Finally in terms of completing general scientific information on these systems, the following studies would be useful:

1) The reactions of O_3 with $CClHCH_2$ and CCl_2CClH could be studied.

2) Temperature studies could be made on all the systems.

INTRODUCTION

An earlier review (1) covered the literature on the gas-phase oxidation of perhalocarbons. Since then concern has developed that the chlorinated ethylenes, which are used as solvents and for other industrial use, may be accumulating in urban atmospheres. Of particular concern is vinyl chloride which has been shown to be a mild carcinogen. Also there has developed recently a serious concern that some of the commonly used chloromethanes may adversely affect the ozone concentration in the stratospheric layer surrounding our planet (2-4). Therefore we undertook an extensive study of the oxidation of chloroethylenes and chlorofluoromethanes with financial support from the Environmental Protection Agency through Grant No. R 800949. The results of these studies are presented here. For the sake of completion we also discuss the pertinent experimental data and their interpretations from other laboratories.

I. CHLOROETHYLENE OXIDATION

EXPERIMENTAL

Photochemical Experiments:

Most of the irradiation experiments were done in an infrared quartz or Pyrex cell with NaCl windows. The gases in the cell were irradiated by radiation from a suitable Hg lamp which had passed through appropriate filters to provide the desired wavelength and intensity of radiation. The reaction cell was situated in the sample beam of a Beckman IR-10 infrared spectrometer for continual analysis of the reactants and products.

The experiments utilized conventional static photochemical techniques. The working part of the vacuum system was greaseless, employing Teflon stopcocks and greaseless joints with Viton O-rings. For pressures <5 Torr, a Consolidated Vacuum Corp. McLeod gauge was used whenever possible. Pressures between 5 and 50 Torr were measured in a Wallace and Tiernan absolute pressure indicator. Pressures larger than 50 Torr were measured in a mercury manometer.

Materials: All gases were Matheson C.P. grade. When it was possible they were purified by bulb to bulb distillation in the vacuum line and degassed at -196°C before each run. The C_2Cl_4 was Baker Analyzed, chlorine free. The fraction volatile at -21°C but condensable at -90°C was used. It was degassed before each run from a trap at -90°C. The $CCl_3CCl(O)$ was from Eastman Kodak Co. and was fractionated in the same manner as C_2Cl_4 before use.

Chlorine (Matheson, 99.5% purity) was degassed thoroughly, and then repeatedly exposed to KOH pellets to remove the HCl. The absence of HCl was confirmed by infrared analysis. The chlorine was then slowly distilled into the storage vessel by keeping the $KOH-H_2O-KCl$ mixture at as

low a temperature as practical.

The C_2HCl_3 was Baker Analyzed, and the fraction volatile at -21°C but condensable at -90°C was used. It was degassed before each run at -90°C. The $CCl_2HCCl(O)$ was from Eastman Kodak Co. and was fractionated in the same manner as C_2HCl_3 before use.

The CCl_2CH_2 was from J. T. Baker, and the fraction volatile at -80°C but condensable at -130°C was used. It was degassed before each run at -130°C. Because it polymerized spontaneously in the storage vessel, it was repurified periodically. For the O_3 experiments the CCl_2CH_2 was obtained from the Fisher Scientific Co. and distilled at -98°C before use.

The cis- and trans-CHClCHCl were obtained from the Aldrich Chemical Co. They were distilled at -50°C. Before use they were degassed at -80°C. Infrared analysis indicated no impurity bands.

The CFClCFCl and CF_2CCl_2 were from the Peninsular ChemResearch Co. The fractions volatile at -20°C, but condensable at -80°C, were used. Infrared analysis showed no impurity peaks. The CFClCFCl was a mixture of the cis- and trans-isomers, and these could not be separated.

The C_2H_3Cl was from the Matheson Co. Before use, it was distilled at -80°C and collected and degassed at -196°C. Its infrared spectrum showed no impurity peaks.

Procedure: The gases were saturated with mercury vapor at room temperature and mixed directly in the cell. For Hg-sensitized experiments (directly or to produce $O(^3P)$ from N_2O decomposition) a drop of Hg was in the cell.

Three reaction cells were used. Cell No. 1 was a cylindrical quartz vessel 5 cm in diameter and 10 cm long. Cells No. 2 and 3 were Pyrex

T-shaped cells. For each cell the stem of the T had a 5 cm diameter quartz window to permit entrance of the radiation. The top of the T had two NaCl windows, each 5 cm in diameter for infrared analysis. The windows were attached to the cells with Carter's epoxy cement. The lengths of the tops of the T cells were 6.7 and 12.7 cm, respectively, and were situated in the sample beam of a Beckman IR-10 infrared spectrometer for continual analysis.

For Hg-sensitization experiments, either of the chloroethylene directly or of N_2O to produce $O(^3P)$ atoms, irradiation was from a Hanovia flat-spiral, low-pressure mercury resonance lamp. Before entering the reaction cell, the radiation passed through a Corning 9-54 filter to remove radiation below 2200Å. When reduced intensities were desired, Corning 9-30 filters were inserted between the lamp and reaction vessel. Actinometry was obtained from the Hg-photosensitized decomposition of N_2O in the presence of 1-2% C_2F_4 to scavenge the $O(^3P)$ atoms produced. For this system the quantum yield of N_2 production $\Phi\{N_2\} = 1.0$. For chlorine photolysis experiments, radiation was from a GE-H100-A4/T medium pressure Hg lamp with a Pyrex envelope. The radiation was filtered through a 3.08 cm thick Corning 7-54 filter to remove visible radiation and isolate the 3660Å line of Hg.

Some experiments were done in a 10 cm long by 5 cm diameter quartz cell with a pinhole bleed. The reaction mixture exited continuously, prior to and during each photolysis, through the pinhole into 8 mm Pyrex tubing which led through a second pinhole into a modified E.A.I. 160 quadrupole mass spectrometer for analysis. The leak rate of the first pinhole was sufficiently small so that the pressure drop in the reaction vessel was negligible during the time of the experiment.

Whether infrared or mass spectral analysis was used, after some of the experiments, the products were also analyzed by gas chromatography. The gases noncondensable at -196°C (CO, N_2) were analyzed using an 8-10 ft. long 5Å molecular sieve column at 0°C with a He flow rate of 60-100 cc/min. When O_2 was present as a reactant gas an additional 10-ft. long column was used to aid in separating the N_2 and O_2. Gas chromatographic analysis for CO_2 was made utilizing a 24 ft. long column packed with Porapak Q operating at 25°C and a H_2 carrier gas flow rate of 60 cc/min.

Finally after completion of some of the runs analyzed continually by infrared analysis, mass spectral analysis was performed, and vice versa.

Ozone Experiments:

For the experiments in which O_3 was used, a mercury-free line was necessary. The gases were mixed in a kinetic apparatus consisting of two 100 cc bulbs connected by a T-stopcock (one that opens simultaneously in three directions) to a stem adaptor which leads either through a stopcock to the vacuum line or through a stopcock to the optical cell. Silicone grease was used in all the stopcocks. Two optical cells were used. One was a 10.0 cm long quartz cell for following O_3 decay at 2537Å in a Cary 14 spectrometer. The other cell was ~10 cm long and had NaCl, KBr, or CsBr windows to permit monitoring olefin decay and phosgene - acid chloride appearance by infrared spectroscopy. A Perkin-Elmer 112 infrared spectrometer with a CaF_2 prism was used. All experiments were performed at room temperature, about 25°C.

Before a run, the kinetic apparatus was evacuated for at least an hour by an oil diffusion pump and then conditioned for 10 min. with about 5 Torr of O_3 before final evacuation. The O_3 was prepared from a tesla coil discharge through O_2, the excess O_2 being removed at -196°C.

A desired amount of freshly prepared O_3 was then measured into the cell with a Kel-F oil manometer. The half-life of the O_3 in the cell was about 8 h., which was very much longer than the rest of the procedure.

The kinetic apparatus then was removed from the vacuum line and transferred to the appropriate spectrometer with the cell in the optical path. The spectrometer was set at a fixed wavelength, and the reaction was initiated by opening the T-stopcock first and then opening and closing the stopcock to the cell. The reaction was followed continuously for 4 or more half-lives and then intermittently for 3 more to get an infinity point. The initial pressures of the olefin and diluent gas in the cell were calculated using the measured ratio of the volumes of the bulbs to the entire kinetic apparatus. These were 0.485 for the infrared cell and 0.75 for the quartz cell. Kinetic runs in which the O_3 was added to the olefin were performed in a similar manner by reversing the roles of the O_3 and olefin.

Runs for product analysis were performed in the infrared cell in the manner described for the kinetic runs, except that the entire region (4000-600 cm^{-1}) was scanned on a Perkin-Elmer 521 grating infrared spectrometer. HCl was identified from its known band sequence (2750-3050 cm^{-1}), but no quantitative estimates could be made. Quantitative analysis for the olefin, CHClO, $CCl_3CCl(O)$, CCl_2O, $CH_2ClCCl(O)$, and CO were made from their respective bands. In experiments to measure O_2, the diluent gas was a halocarbon (CCl_4, CH_2Cl_2, or CF_3CFCl_2) that was condensable

at -196°C. The residual pressure of the gas noncondensable at -196°C was considered to be CO plus O_2, and the O_2 computed by difference.

For some reactions in the C_2Cl_4 system, used in conjunction with the Beckman IR-10 instrument, the reactants were mixed by freezing into a cold finger on the infrared cell and then permitted to vaporize.

Cl-ATOM INITIATED OXIDATION

The chlorine-atom initiated oxidation of chloro- and chlorofluoroethylenes has been studied in our laboratory (5-9). Previously the chlorine atom initiated oxidation of C_2Cl_4 (10-13), C_2HCl_3 (14-16), and CHClCHCl (17) had been studied. The oxidation of CCl_2CCl_2, $CHClCCl_2$, CH_2Cl_2, cis-CHClCHCl, trans-CHClCHCl, CF_2CCl_2, and CFClCFCl (mixed cis and trans) proceed by a long chain free-radical process. The major products are the corresponding acid chlorides containing 1 or 2 carbon atoms. By contrast there is no chain process in $CHClCH_2$. The oxidation products and chain lengths are summarized in Table I. Also included in Table I are some preliminary results (18) on the chlorine-atom initiated oxidation of CF_2CF_2 and CF_2CFCl. These oxidations also involve long-chain reactions. For most of the chloroethylenes, the chain length of the reaction exceeds 100 at sufficiently high O_2 pressures, and is independent of the absorbed light intensity, I_a, or any of the reactant pressures.

Table I

The chlorine-atom sensitized oxidation of $C_2Cl_{4-n}H_n$ and $C_2Cl_{4-n}F_n$

Compound	Oxidation Products (%)	$\Phi\{OX\}$[a]	k_{2a}/k_{2b}[b]	k_4/k_{4b}	k_{6a}/k_{6b}[c]	Ref.[d]	log k_2[e] ($M^{-1}sec^{-1}$)
CCl_2CCl_2	$CCl_3CCl(O)$ (75%), CCl_2O (25%)	300[f]	1	150	6.0	5,13	10.1
CCl_2CHCl	$CHCl_2CCl(O)$ (90%), CO and CCl_2O	200[f]	∿10	100	>6	15,16	10.6
CCl_2CH_2	$CH_2ClCCl(O)$ (98%), CO and CCl_2O	172	≳100	86	>50	6	
cis-CClHCClH	CHClO (71%), CO (26%) and CCl_2O (3%)[g]	21.5	1	19	<50	7	10.6
trans-CClHCClH	CHClO (71%), CO (26%) and CCl_2O (3%)[g]	21.5	1	19	<50	7	10.6
$CClHCH_2$	CHClO (74%) and CO (25%)[h]	∿2	>10				
CF_2CCl_2	$CClF_2CCl(O)$ (91%) CCl_2O (4%), CF_2O (4%)	∿85	≥20		>22	9	
CFClCFCl[i]	$CCl_2FCF(O)$ (∿100%)	420	1	210	>50	9	
$CClFCF_2$	$CClF_2CF(O)$ (∿95%)	>1000	>10		>20	18	
CF_2CF_2	CF_2O (100%)	∿250	1		<50	18	

a) $\Phi\{OX\} = -\Phi\{olefin\}$.
b) Calculated from product distribution.
c) At 30-32°C.
d) From Reference 23.
e) Reference for k_{6a}/k_{6b}.
f) At high O_2 pressure.
g) In these olefins, geometrical isomerization of the starting olefin is an important process especially at low total pressure.
h) At high $[O_2]/[Cl_2]$ ratios.
i) Equilibrium mixture of cis and trans isomers.

The generalized mechanism which explained both the chlorination and oxidation was elucidated by Huybrechts et al (13, 15, 19). In their studies of the photochlorination of $CClHCCl_2$ at 363 and 403°K, they found that small amounts of oxygen inhibited the photochlorination, but that the reaction proceeded further in the dark after irradiation was terminated (19). They interpreted this after-effect to be due to the formation of a semi-stable peroxide which decomposes in the dark on the walls of the reaction vessel to reinitiate the chain chlorination.

Further studies of the photooxidation of $CClHCCl_2$ (15) completed the earlier work of Müller and Schumacher (14) and showed that the principal oxidation product was $CCl_2HCCl(O)$ which accounted for $\geq$90% of the oxidation at 363°K and $\geq$82% of the oxidation at 403°K. Likewise they studied the chlorine-sensitized photooxidation and the simultaneous oxygen-inhibited photochlorination of CCl_2CCl_2 and C_2HCl_5 at 353.5 and 373.4°K. Both systems produced C_2Cl_5 radicals as the chain carrier. The results of the two systems were the same and nearly identical to those of Schumacher et al (12, 20); 85 ± 5% of the oxidized CCl_2CCl_2 and C_2HCl_5 appeared as $CCl_3CCl(O)$ and 15 ± 5% as CCl_2O. Trace quantities of CCl_4 (0.3%) and $\overline{CCl_2CCl_2}O$ (0.1%) were also present. The quantum yield of oxidation, $\Phi\{OX\}$, increased with the oxygen pressure to an upper limiting value of about 300 for C_2Cl_5 radical oxidation and about 200 for $CHCl_2CCl_2$ oxidation, independent of absorbed intensity, I_a, chlorocarbon pressure, Cl_2 pressure, or added N_2 pressure. Huybechts et al (13, 15) emphasized the different light-intensity dependence in the quantum yields for the oxygen inhibited chlorination ($I_a^{-1/2}$) and the high O_2-pressure limiting oxidation (intensity independent). They showed that since these two reactions are coupled they have common chain-breaking steps, which must be bimolecular in radicals to explain the $I_a^{-1/2}$ dependence of the

quantum yield of chlorination. This led them to propose the following general mechanism:

$$Cl_2 + h\nu \rightarrow 2Cl \qquad 1$$

$$Cl + CX_2CXCl \rightarrow ClCX_2CXCl \qquad 2a$$

$$\rightarrow CX_2CXCl_2 \qquad 2b$$

$$ClCX_2CXCl + O_2 \rightarrow ClCX_2CXClO_2 \qquad 3$$

$$CX_2CXCl_2 + O_2 \rightarrow CXCl_2CX_2O_2 \qquad 3'$$

$$2ClCX_2CXClO_2 \rightarrow 2ClCX_2CXClO + O_2 \qquad 4a$$

$$\rightarrow (ClCX_2CXClO)_2 + O_2 \qquad 4b$$

$$2CXCl_2CX_2O_2 \rightarrow 2CXCl_2CX_2O + O_2 \qquad 4a'$$

$$\rightarrow (CXCl_2CX_2O)_2 + O_2 \qquad 4b'$$

$$ClCX_2CXClO_2 + ClCX_2CXCl \rightarrow (ClCX_2CX_2ClO)_2 \qquad 5$$

$$ClCX_2CXClO \rightarrow ClCX_2CX(O) + Cl \qquad 6a$$

$$\rightarrow CXClO + ClCX_2 \qquad 6b$$

$$CXCl_2CX_2O \rightarrow CXCl_2CX(O) + X \qquad 6a'$$

$$\rightarrow CXCl_2 + CX_2O \qquad 6b'$$

$$ClCX_2 + O_2 \rightarrow CX_2O + Cl + (1/2)O_2 \qquad 7a$$

Reaction 7a, of course, is not a fundamental reaction, but must proceed through several steps, which presumably are:

$$ClCX_2 + O_2 \rightarrow ClCX_2O_2$$

$$2ClCX_2O_2 \rightarrow 2ClCX_2O + O_2$$

$$ClCX_2O \rightarrow CX_2O + Cl$$

However there is an alternative to reaction 7a that could account for the oxidation in which the ClO radical is an intermediate but in which $ClCX_2O$ is not:

$$ClCX_2 + O_2 \rightarrow CX_2O + ClO \qquad 8$$

$$ClO + CX_2CXCl \rightarrow CX_2ClCXClO \qquad 9$$

Mathias et al (5) tested the two possibilities. They examined the chlorine-atom sensitized oxidation of C_2Cl_4 in the presence of O_3 to insure that ClO was produced via the well established rapid reaction (21)

$$Cl + O_3 \rightarrow ClO + O_2 \qquad 10$$

With O_3 present, the epoxide, $\overline{CCl_2CCl_2O}$, was produced. Since the epoxide production depended on the ratio $[C_2Cl_4]/[O_3]$, it was concluded that the epoxide came from

$$C_2Cl_4 + ClO \rightarrow \overline{CCl_2CCl_2O} + Cl \qquad 11a$$

No epoxide was produced in the absence of O_3, so presumably ClO radicals are absent, and reaction 7a is the correct representation of the oxidation of CCl_3 radicals.

From the experiments of Huybrechts et al (13, 15) and Mathias et al (5), reaction 7a was established for CCl_3 radicals. In order to examine the oxidation of partially chlorinated methyl radicals, Sanhueza and Heicklen (22) examined the chlorine-atom sensitized oxidation of CH_2Cl_2 and CH_3Cl to study the oxidation of $CHCl_2$ and CH_2Cl, respectively. They found that $CHCl_2$ oxidized just like CCl_3, but that CH_2Cl oxidation did not generate the chlorine atom. Presumably the oxidation of this radical is analogous to that for CH_3 radicals.

$$ClCH_2 + O_2 \rightarrow CHClO \text{ via termination} \qquad 7b$$

In the CCl_2CCl_2 and $CHClCCl_2$ systems, the quantum yields of oxidation products increased with the O_2 pressure until upper limiting values were reached. The mechanism predicts that if termination is exclusively by reaction 5, then

$$\Phi(X) = \left(\frac{2k_1{}^4k_4}{k_5{}^2}\right)^{1/3}\left(\frac{[O_2]^2}{I_a}\right)^{1/3} \qquad I$$

However if termination is exclusively by reaction 4b, then

$$\Phi\{OX\} = 2k_{4}/k_{4b} \qquad II$$

where $\Phi\{OX\} = -\Phi\{olefin\} = \Phi\{ClCX_2CCl(O)\} + (1/2)\Phi\{CX_2O\} + (1/2)\Phi\{CO\}$. Eqn. I applies at low values of $[O_2]'/I_a$, whereas eqn. II applies at high values of $[O_2]^2/I_a$.

In the oxidation of CH_2CCl_2, cis-CHClCHCl, trans-CHClCHCl and CFClCFCl the quantum yields of the oxidation products are insensitive to all the reaction parameters and the termination must be by reaction 4b exclusively; eqn. II always applies. However in the oxidation of CCl_2CH_2, since CH_2Cl always is oxidized in a non-chain process, reaction 6b' also can be a terminating step.

In the oxidation of CF_2CCl_2 there is one striking difference from the results of the other chloro-and/or fluoroethylenes: $\Phi\{CF_2ClCCl(O)\}$ is reduced at high pressure, but $\Phi\{CF_2O\}$ is not. Thus the details of the mechanism contain some additional subtle deviation from the general mechanism outlined above. A possible explanation is given in detail in the original work (9).

In Table I the experimental results are summarized, and in Table II the bond energies of the chloroethoxy radicals involved in the process of oxidation of the chloroolefins are presented. From Tables I and II it is possible to deduce the following information:

1) From the values of k_{2a}/k_{2b} (obtained mainly from the distribution of products) it is possible to conclude that the chlorine atom prefers to attack the less chlorinated carbon atom. In the most unsymmetrical cases (CCl_2CH_2 and CCl_2CF_2), the preference for the non-chlorinated carbon atom is at least a factor of 20. The chloroolefins with one or three chlorine atoms also show a high preference for substitution on the less chlorinated

Table II

Bond energies (kcal/mole) in chloroethoxy radicals[a]

RO	D{C-H}[b]	D{C-Cl}[b]	D{C-C}[c]	D{C-Cl} - D{C-C}	k_{6a}/k_{6b}
CCl_3CCl_2O	--	-17	-20	+3	6.0
CCl_2HCCl_2O	--	-16	-13	-3	>6.0
CCl_3CHClO	6	-4	-16	+12	<10
$CClH_2CCl_2O$	--	-20.8	-11.6	-9.2	>50
CCl_3CH_2O	17	--	11	--	--[c]
$CCl_2HCHClO$	6	-5	-11	+6	<50
$CClH_2CHClO$	2	-4	-8	+4	<10
CCl_2HCH_2O	14.8	--	7	--	--[d]

a) The values are mostly from Reference 24.
b) D{C-H} and D{C-Cl} represent the bond energies for loss of H or Cl, respectively, from the oxygen-bearing carbon atom.
c) Neither of the products $CCl_3CH(O)$ nor CH_2O was observed experimentally ($k_{2a}/k_{2b} \gtrsim 100$).
d) Neither of the products $CHCl_2CH(O)$ nor CH_2O was observed experimentally.

carbon atom. In particular this was demonstrated for CCl_2CHCl by Bertrand et al (16) at 357°K, who found the preference for chlorine-atom addition to the less chlorinated carbon atom to be at least 8 times greater than for addition to the more chlorinated one. They did this by comparing the products of the reaction with those produced from the photochlorinated oxidation of CH_2ClCCl_3 (to produce CCl_3CClH) and $CHCl_2CHCl_2$ (to produce CCl_2HCCl_2). Of course the symmetrical chloroethylenes can show no preference and k_{2a} and k_{2b} are indistinguishable.

The inductive (I^-) and mesomeric (M^+) effects of the three substituent atoms are F > Cl > H.



Inductive



Mesomeric



Inductive



Mesomeric

If these effects dominated the chlorine-atom addition, then H and F substitution should give different results. However the chlorine atom always prefers to add to the less chlorinated carbon atom. Thus we conclude that steric effects must dominate the addition process.

2) A long-chain oxidation (> 150) occurs when the exothermicity of either reaction 6a or 6b is greater than 11 kcal/mole. For an exothermicity of 11 kcal/mole, a relatively short-chain length (∿ 20) is involved.

3) In $CHClCH_2$, the radical produced is $CH_2ClCHClO$, and the exothermicity of decay of this radical by any route is < 11 kcal/mole. The favored route to decay (most exothermic) is by C-C cleavage which produces the terminating radical CH_2Cl. Thus one cannot be certain that the parent radical would, of itself, lead to short chains.

4) The reaction

$$ClCX_2CXHO \rightarrow ClCX_2CX(O) + H$$

is always energetically less favorable than the cleavage of either the C-C bond or the oxygenated carbon-chlorine bond. There was no evidence that this reaction occurred in any of the systems studied.

5) In radicals of the type CX_3CH_2O, all the decomposition routes are sufficiently endothermic so that no decay products are observed. Thus in the oxidation of CCl_3CH_3 no CH_2O or $CCl_3CH(O)$ was found as products, and in the oxidation of $CHClCH_2$, no $CHCl_2CH(O)$ or CH_2O was found as products.

6) When D(C-Cl) - D(C-C) is $\geq$ 6 kcal/mole, almost all the chlorinated ethoxy radical decomposition goes through reaction 6b. When D(C-Cl) - D(C-C) $\leq$ -3 kcal/mole almost all the decomposition proceeds through reaction 6a. For intermediate values of the bond energy difference, both reaction paths are significant.

7) The chlorine-atom initiated oxidation of all the perfluorochloro-olefins ($C_2F_{4-n}Cl_n$) which have been studied gives long chains. No study has been made for $CClFCCl_2$, but there is no reason to believe that its oxidation will not proceed through a long-chain process.

8) In the mixed chlorofluoroethylenes, the products are almost entirely ($\geq$ 90%) the two-carbon acid chloride. Thus we would expect that D(C-Cl) - D(C-C) $\leq$ -3 in the ethoxy radical precursor. This observation can be compared to the results for cis- and trans-$CHClCHCl$, where no two-carbon carbonyl compounds were found. Thus the substitution of F for H either strengthens the

C-C bond or weakens the oxygen-bearing carbon-chlorine bond or both. 9) In C_2F_5, the two-carbon carbonyl compound is missing. Thus we conclude that the C-F bond is stronger than the C-C bond in the ethoxy radical, whereas in CX_3CXClO the carbon-chlorine bond is weaker than C-C bond.

Vinyl Chloride:

The chlorine-atom sensitized oxidation of $CHClCH_2$ is unique among the chlorooleiin oxidations for three reasons: 1) CO is produced as a major initial product of the reaction, the ratio [CO]/[CHClO] being almost independent of reaction parameters, 2) there is no chain at high values of the ratio $[O_2]/[Cl_2]$ and 3) at low values of $[O_2]/[Cl_2]$, there is a long chain process which consumes Cl_2 and produces $CH_2ClCCl(O)$ as the principal chain product.

The production of CO as an initial product is explained by a slight extension of reaction 6

$$CH_2ClCHClO \rightarrow CH_2Cl + CO + HCl \qquad 6c$$

where reaction 6c probably proceeds through an energetic CHClO molecule which always decomposes. Reaction 6b to produce CHClO as a product still occurs but represents that fraction of reaction 6 in which the CHClO produced is stabilized. The same results were found in the CHClCHCl oxidation.

The lack of a chain reaction at high $[O_2]/[Cl_2]$ pressures is the result of the fact that reaction 6a does not occur and that reactions 6b and 6c produce the terminating radical CH_2Cl. Presumably the termination reaction 7b, occurs via the sequence of steps (22)

$$CH_2Cl + O_2 \rightarrow CH_2ClO_2$$

$$2CH_2ClO_2 \rightarrow 2CH_2ClO + O_2$$

followed by

$$CH_2ClO_2 + CH_2ClO \rightarrow 2CHClO + H_2O$$

or

$$CH_2ClO + O_2 \rightarrow CHClO + HO_2$$

$$CH_2ClO_2 + HO_2 \rightarrow CHClO + H_2O + O_2$$

The production of $CH_2ClCCl(O)$ and the dependence of the results on the Cl_2 pressure represent findings not seen in any other chloroethylene and which were explained (8) by the competition:

$$CH_2ClCHCl + O_2 \rightarrow CH_2ClCHClO_2 \qquad 3$$

$$CH_2ClCHCl + Cl_2 \rightarrow CH_2ClCCl_2 + HCl \qquad 12$$

where reaction 12 is then followed by oxidation to produce $CH_2ClCCl(O)$ as it does in the CH_2CCl_2 system. The competition between reactions 3 and 12 leads to the rate law

$$\Phi\{CH_2ClCCl(O)\} = \frac{k_{12}[Cl_2]}{k_3[O_2]} \qquad III$$

since ultimately reaction 12 regenerates the chain. A log-log plot of $\Phi\{CH_2ClCCl(O)\}$ vs $[O_2]/[Cl_2]$ is shown in Fig. 1. It is fitted reasonably by a straight line of slope - 1. The intercept yields a value for $k_{12}/k_3 = 9.5$.

Confirmation that the chlorine-atom initiated oxidation of $CClHCH_2$ does not lead to a chain process comes from the work of Bertrand et al (24) who studied the chlorine-atom initiated oxidation of 1,2-$C_2H_4Cl_2$ at 353°K to produce $CClH_2CClH$. Furthermore they showed that chloroethyl radicals not chlorinated on the α-carbon do not lead to chain oxidations by examining the chlorine-atom initiated oxidation of C_2H_4 (to produce $CClH_2CH_2$) and CCl_3CH_3 (to produce CCl_3CH_2). Earlier work (25) on the chlorine-atom initiated oxidation of C_2H_6 had shown that C_2H_5 also does not enter a chain oxidation.



Figure 1: Log-log plot of $\Phi\{CH_2ClCCl(O)\}$ vs. $[O_2]/[Cl_2]$ in the chlorine-atom initiated oxidation of C_2H_3Cl at 31°C. From Sanhueza and Heicklen (8) with permission of the American Chemical Society.

O_3 Present:

The chlorine-atom initiated oxidation of C_2Cl_4 was studied in the presence of O_3, since the dark reaction for this system was very slow (5). The addition of O_3 to the system introduced three major changes:

1) The ratio $\Phi\{CCl_3CCl(O)\}/\Phi\{CCl_2O\}$ dropped as the $[O_3]/[O_2]$ ratio was increased but was unaffected by changes in $[O_3]/[C_2Cl_4]$. The effect of the $[O_3]/[O_2]$ ratio is seen in Fig. 2. There is considerable scatter in the data, but at 32° the ratio drops from about 3.0 in the absence of O_3 to about 1.0 at $[O_3]/[O_2] > 10$. The data points at 24°C lie below those at 32°C, as they do in the absence of O_2. The shift in the ratio was attributed to the production of $CCl_3CCl(O)$ and CCl_2O via

$$C_2Cl_5 + O_3 \rightarrow CCl_3CCl(O) + Cl + O_2 \qquad 13a$$

$$\rightarrow CCl_2O + CCl_3O_2 \text{ (or } CCl_3 + O_2) \qquad 13b$$

where the ratio k_{13a}/k_{13b} is smaller than k_{6a}/k_{6b}. It was argued (5) that reactions 13a and 13b proceeded directly and not through energetic $C_2Cl_5O^*$ radicals, since the thermal effect was known to move the product ratio in the opposite direction (5).

2) The overall rate of the oxidation was reduced as the $[O_3]/[C_2Cl_4]$ ratio was raised. This was attributed to the production of ClO radicals via reaction 10 followed by the competition of C_2Cl_4 and O_3 for ClO. Most of the time that ClO reacted with O_3, the chain is regenerated.

$$ClO + O_3 \rightarrow Cl + 2O_2 \qquad 14a$$

but occasionally termination might occur by

$$ClO + O_3 \rightarrow OClO + O_2 \qquad 14b$$

followed by subsequent oxidation of OClO to produce the observed product Cl_2O_7.



Figure 2: Log-log plot of the ratio of the quantum yields of $CCl_3CCl(O)$ and CCl_2O vs. $[O_3]/[O_2]$ in the chlorine-atom sensitized oxidation of C_2Cl_4 by O_2 and O_3 at 32°C. From Mathias et al (5) with permission of the National Research Council of Canada.

3) $\overline{CCl_2CCl_2O}$ was produced, its quantum yield depending mainly on the $[C_2Cl_4]/[O_3]$ ratio. This result suggested that it was produced in the $ClO-C_2Cl_4$ interaction:

$$ClO + C_2Cl_4 \rightarrow \overline{CCl_2CCl_2O} + Cl \qquad 11a$$

$$\rightarrow CCl_3CCl(O) + Cl \qquad 11b$$

$$\rightarrow CCl_2O + CCl_3 \qquad 11c$$

Since the chain length was long under all conditions, the mechanism predicted that

$$\frac{\Phi\{CCl_3CCl(O)\} + (1/2)\,\Phi\{CCl_2O\}}{\Phi\{\overline{CCl_2CCl_2O}\}} = \frac{k_{11b} + k_{11c}}{k_{11a}} + \frac{k_2k_{13}}{k_{11a}k_{10}} + \frac{k_2k_{13}}{k_{10}k_{14a}}\frac{[C_2Cl_4]}{[O_3]} \qquad IV$$

Fig. 3 is a plot of the left-hand side of eqn. IV vs. $[C_2Cl_4]/[O_3]$, and it is seen that a straight line plot passing through the origin is obtained. Thus reaction 11b and 11c are unimportant.

<u>F_2-Initiated Oxidation</u>:

Miller and Dittman (26) passed mixtures of F_2 and O_2 into C_2Cl_4 or C_2F_3Cl at 0°C. Presumably the oxidation is similar to that initiated by chlorine atoms. With C_2Cl_4 the products, in decreasing order of abundance were $CCl_3CCl(O)$, $CCl_2FCCl(O)$, CCl_2O, C_2Cl_6, and Cl_2. Trace amounts of $(CFCl_2)_2$ and C_2Cl_5F were also observed. With C_2F_3Cl the major product was $CF_2ClCF(O)$ with $CFClO$, CF_2O, and CF_3CFO also formed. The main feature of the two systems can be explained in terms of C_2Cl_4F and C_2F_4Cl oxidation, respectively.

Hg $6(^3P)$ SENSITIZATION

The Hg photosensitized oxidation of three chloroolefins (CCl_2CCl_2, $CHClCCl_2$, and CH_2CCl_2) have been studied in our laboratory (6, 27, 28). For two of these olefins the mercury-sensitization was also studied in the absence of O_2, and we will discuss these results first.



Figure 3: Plot of $(\Phi\{CCl_3CCl(O)\} + (1/2)\Phi\{CCl_2O\})/\Phi\{\overline{CCl_2CCl_2O}\}$ vs. $[C_2Cl_4]/[O_3]$ in the chlorine-atom sensitized oxidation of C_2Cl_4 by O_2 and O_3 at 32°C. From Mathias et al (5) with permission of the National Research Council of Canada.

O_2 Absent:

The Hg photosensitized decomposition of CCl_2CCl_2 (27) and $CHClCCl_2$ (28) were studied. The results were similar in the two studies. The products were Hg_2Cl_2 and polymeric material. The quantum yield of olefin loss, $-\Phi\{CX_2CCl_2\}$ (X = H, Cl), was $\sim$ 1, independent of olefin pressure and nearly independent of absorbed intensity, I_a. ($-\Phi\{CHClCCl_2\}$ appeared to be between 1.5 and 2.0 at low I_a). In the $CHClCCl_2$ study small amounts of another unidentified product were found.

The results indicate that a long-chain polymerization of the olefin is not involved, since $-\Phi\{CX_2CCl_2\} \simeq 1.0$. Double-bond cleavage can be eliminated since c-C_3Cl_4 was not produced in the CCl_2CCl_2 system and mixed ethylenes were not produced in the $CHClCCl_2$ system. Molecular elimination does not seem likely, and in fact the results with O_2 present eliminate that possibility as a major reaction path. It was concluded that free radicals must have been produced by one of the following processes:

$$Hg\ 6(^3P) + CX_2CCl_2 \rightarrow C_2X_4Cl + (1/2)\ Hg_2Cl_2 \qquad 15a$$

or

$$Hg\ 6(^3P) + CX_2CCl_2 \rightarrow Hg\ 6(^1S) + CX_2CCl_2^* \qquad 15b$$

$$Hg\ 6(^1S) + CX_2CCl_2^* \rightarrow C_2X_4Cl + (1/2)\ Hg_2Cl_2 \qquad 16$$

In the case of $CHClCCl_2$, the possibility also exists of producing $C_2Cl_3 + H + Hg\ 6(^1S)$ as products, either directly or through the excited molecule mechanism. Presumably the C_2X_2Cl radical dimerizes, and the resulting 1,3-butadiene polymerizes.

The above mechanism to produce free radicals is markedly different than for the Hg-photosensitized decomposition of the fluoroethylenes or C_2H_4. Ethylene and the fluoroethylenes (except for C_2F_4) decompose by

molecular elimination of H_2 (29) and HF (30) respectively. C_2F_4 (31-33), and to a slight extent trifluoroethylene (30b), decompose by double-bond cleavage.

For C_2F_4 the mechanism that explained the results was:

$$Hg\ 6(^3P_1) + CF_2CF_2 \rightarrow Hg\ 6(^1S_0) + (CF_2CF_2)_n^* \qquad 15b'$$

$$(CF_2CF_2)_n^* \rightarrow 2\ {}^1CF_2 \qquad 17$$

$$(CF_2CF_2)_n^* + CF_2CF_2 \rightarrow (CF_2CF_2)_0^* + CF_2CF_2 \qquad 18$$

$$(CF_2CF_2)_0^* (+ CF_2CF_2) \rightarrow CF_2CF_2 (+ CF_2CF_2) \qquad 19$$

followed by

$$2\ {}^1CF_2 \rightarrow C_2F_4 \qquad 20$$

$${}^1CF_2 + C_2F_4 \rightarrow c\text{-}C_3F_6 \qquad 21$$

where the superscript * represents an electronically excited state, the subscripts n and 0 represent, respectively, molecules with either sufficient or insufficient energy to dissociate, and $^1CF_2$ is the singlet CF_2 diradical.

The rate coefficients for the quenching of Hg $6(^3P)$ by the olefins have been measured. Relative to N_2O they are 3.0 for C_2Cl_4 (27), 4.1 for $CHClCCl_2$ (29), 0.35 for C_2F_4 (1), and 1.8 for C_2H_4 (29).

O_2 Present:

The Hg-photosensitized oxidation of C_2F_4 has been reported in two studies (33,34) and reviewed by Heicklen (1). A complete mechanism has been presented and discussed in detail (34). The products of the reaction were cyclo-C_3F_6, CF_2O and $\overline{CF_2CF_2O}$ (tetrafluoroethylene oxide).

The mechanism is very complex. However the oxidation products can be explained as coming from the following reactions involving a diradical.

$$(C_2F_4)_0^* + O_2 \rightarrow CF_2O_2 + {}^1CF_2 \qquad 22$$

$${}^1CF_2 + C_2F_4 \rightarrow c\text{-}C_3F_6 \qquad 21$$

$$CF_2O_2 + C_2F_4 \rightarrow 2CF_2O + {}^3CF_2 \qquad 23a$$

$$\rightarrow CF_2O + \dot{C}F_2CF_2\dot{O} \qquad 23b$$

$${}^1CF_2 + O_2 \rightarrow CF_2O_2 \qquad 24$$

Here $(C_2F_4)_0^*$ is a vibrationally equilibrated electronically excited C_2F_4 molecule; ${}^1CF_2$ and ${}^3CF_2$ are the singlet and triplet of CF_2 radical respectively.

For the chloroolefins in the presence of O_2, a long-chain process occurs. The major products are the same as for the chlorine-atom initiated oxidation of the corresponding chloroolefin, and these products are produced in the same ratio. There are two major differences for the two modes of initiating the oxidation:

1) At high $[O_2]/I_a^{1/2}$ the quantum yields are independent of the reactant pressures and I_a for chlorine-atom initiation. For Hg $6({}^3P)$ sensitization, at low $[O_2]/[CX_2CCl_2]$ (to minimize removal of Hg $6({}^3P)$ by O_2) the quantum yields are independent of the O_2 pressure and I_a, but they increase proportionately with the chloroolefin pressure.

2) CO is produced as an initial product from the Hg $6({}^3P)$ sensitization but not from chlorine-atom initiation. (CO was found in the $Cl + CHClCCl_2 + O_2$ system (15), but presumably it is a decomposition product of CHClO or formed through energetic CHClO as a precursor).

The conclusions from the above observations are that the same free-radical chain process must occur in both systems, but that the initiation mechanism must be different. In order to explain the facts, Sanhueza and Heicklen (6, 27, 28) utilized the following mechanism for the Hg $6({}^3P)$-sensitized oxidation:

$$Hg\ 6({}^3P) + CX_2CCl_2 \rightarrow CX_2CCl_2^* + Hg\ 6({}^1S) \qquad 15b$$

$$Hg\ 6({}^3P) + O_2 \rightarrow O_2^* + Hg\ 6({}^1S) \qquad 25$$

$$O_2^* + CX_2CCl_2 \rightarrow CX_2CCl_2^* + O_2 \qquad 26$$

$$CX_2CCl_2^* + Hg\ 6(^1S) \rightarrow C_2X_2Cl + (1/2)\ Hg_2Cl_2 \qquad 16$$

$$C_2X_2Cl + O_2 \rightarrow C_2X_2ClO_2 \qquad 27$$

$$C_2X_2ClO_2 \rightarrow CO \text{ via termination} \qquad 28$$

$$C_2X_2ClO_2 + CX_2CCl_2 \rightarrow C_2X_2Cl_2 + (CXO)_2 \qquad 29$$

In the hydrogenated chloroolefins, the product yields decreased as $[O_2]/[CX_2CCl_2]$ increased beyond a certain value (4.0 for $CHClCCl_2$ and 1.8 for CH_2CCl_2). However with C_2Cl_4, there was no decrease in the product yields even at $[O_2]/[C_2Cl_4] = 22$, in spite of the fact that quenching of Hg $6(^1P)$ by O_2 is only slightly less efficient than quenching by C_2Cl_4. Thus it was necessary to postulate that Hg $6(^3P)$ sensitization leads to the production of an excited olefin molecule, regardless of whether the olefin or O_2 quenched the Hg $6(^1P)$ atom. The same postulate was required in the C_2F_4 system (1).

Presumably the free radical C_2X_2Cl adds O_2 and this radical must initiate the chain process. Since the chain process is proportional to $[CX_2CCl_2]$, and initiation must be via reaction (29), the main removal process for $C_2X_2ClO_2$ must be by some process represented by reaction 28. Reaction 28 is, of course, not a fundamental process. In order for termination ultimately to occur, another radical must be involved. Possibly reaction 28 occurs on the wall of the reaction vessel. In any event it must produce the excess CO that is observed as a product.

The mechanism leads to the following rate laws:

$$\Phi\{CO\} = 1.0 \text{ for } CCl_2CCl_2 \text{ and } CH_2CCl_2 \qquad V$$

$$\Phi\{CO\} = 1.0 + \Phi\{CCl_2O\} \text{ for } CHClCCl_2 \qquad V'$$

$$-\Phi\{CX_2CCl_2\} - 1 = (k_1k_{2a}/k_3k_{2a})[C_2Cl_4] \qquad VI$$

$\Phi\{CO\}$ should be higher for $CHClCCl_2$ than for the other chlorooleíins because no CHClO was found. Presumably it was formed "hot" and always decayed to CO + HCl. For the C_2Cl_4 system, $\Phi\{CO\}$ was unity in good agreement with expectation. In the CH_2CCl_2 system, $\Phi\{CO\}$ was somewhat low (0.5 - 1.0), but this probably reflects experimental uncertainty since CO is a minor product. However in the $CHClCCl_2$ system, $\Phi\{CO\} - 1$ was larger than predicted by eqn. V' by a factor of 4.6, and this extra CO has not been satisfactorily explained.

Table III summarizes the rate coefficient data obtained for the three olefins. The values of k_{29}/k_{28} are of the same order of magnitude in the three systems; the variation that does exist does not follow any trend.

It is interesting to compare the above results with those of the photooxidation of C_2F_3I (35) which produces C_2F_3, a radical analogous to C_2X_2Cl

$$C_2F_3I + h\upsilon \rightarrow C_2F_3 + I \qquad 30$$

In this system a small chain occurred which produced CF_2O, CFIO, and C_2F_3OI as major products and $(CFO)_2CF_2$ and $(CFO_2)CF_2(CFO)$ as minor products. The latter products must involve CFO as a precursor and come from the oxidation of C_2F_3,

$$C_2F_3 + O_2 \rightarrow CF_2O + FCO \qquad 31a$$

The main chain steps considered were

$$C_2F_3 + O_2 \rightarrow C_2F_3O_2 \qquad 31b$$

$$C_2F_3O_2 + C_2F_3I \rightarrow C_2F_3 + CF_2O + CFIO \qquad 32a$$

$$\rightarrow C_2F_3OI + C_2F_3O \qquad 32b$$

$$C_2F_3O + I \rightarrow C_2F_3OI \qquad 33$$

Though Heicklen (35) did not consider them, additional chain steps are also possible through the iodine atom as chain carrier

$$I + C_2F_3I \rightarrow CF_2ICFI \qquad 34$$

Table III

Rate coefficient ratios from the Hg 6(^{3}P) sensitized oxidation of chloroethylenes at 30-32°C

Ratio	Units	Value for CCl_2CCl_2[a]	Value for $CHClCCl_2$[b]	Value for CH_2CCl_2[c]
k_{2a}/k_{2b}	None	1	6.7	--
k_{2g}/k_{2e}	$Torr^{-1}$	0.029	0.015	0.058

a) From Reference 27.
b) From Reference 28.
c) From Reference 6.

$$CF_2ICFI + O_2 \rightarrow CF_2ICFIO_2 \qquad 35$$

$$2CF_2ICFIO_2 \rightarrow 2CF_2ICFIO + O_2 \qquad 36$$

$$CF_2ICFIO \rightarrow C_2F_3OI + I \qquad 37a$$

$$\rightarrow CFIO + CF_2I \xrightarrow{O_2} CF_2O + I \qquad 37b$$

In fact reaction 37a is needed to explain the high quantum yields (up to 10) of C_2F_3OI which were observed. Reactions 32b and 33 can only account for $\Phi\{C_2F_3OI\} \leq 2$. It should be noticed that C_2F_3OI is the enol type isomer of $CF_2ICF(O)$, the molecule expected to be produced via reaction 37a if the system were exactly analogous to those of the chlorinated ethylenes.

Thus this system contains many analogous features of the Hg $6(^3P)$ sensitized oxidation of chloroethylenes. Reaction 31a is a termination step corresponding to reaction 27 followed by reaction 28, and reaction 31b followed by reaction 32a is a propagation step corresponding to reaction 27 followed by reaction 29.

REACTION WITH $O(^3P)$ ATOMS

The oxygen atom might react with chloroethylenes by any of the following paths: (X = H, F, Cl)

$$O(^3P) + CXClCX_2 \rightarrow CX_2O + CClX \qquad 38a$$

$$\rightarrow CO + X_2 + CClX \qquad 38b$$

$$\rightarrow CXClCX_2O^* \qquad 38c$$

$$\rightarrow CX_2ClCX(O) \qquad 38d$$

$$\rightarrow CClX_2 + XCO \qquad 38e$$

Each of the reaction paths actually represents only one of two possibilities, since the $O(^3P)$ atom could attack either the more heavily or less heavily chlorinated carbon atom. However we anticipate the results and show that the $O(^3P)$ generally attacks the less chlorinated carbon atom in the chloroethylene.

The diradical CClX enters into one of two reactions.

$$2CClX_2 \cdot \rightarrow CClXCClX \qquad 39$$

$$CClX + CClXCX_3 \cdot \rightarrow \overline{CClXCX_2CClX} \qquad 40$$

The mono-free radicals either add to the chloroethylene or react with each other via combination or disproportionation reactions.

The excited adduct formed in reaction 38c is a species which may undergo many reactions:

1) It may polymerize either with itself or with the parent chloroethylene.
2) It might stabilize as the epoxide.
3) It might react with parent ethylene to give a cyclopropane and a carbonyl compound.
4) It might rearrange to an excited aldehyde which could be stabilized or decompose to free radical products.

Individual Substituted Ethylenes:

Each of the substituted ethylenes behave slightly differently from the others, and we now examine them individually.

CCl_2CCl_2: The mercury-sensitized photolysis of N_2O in the presence of C_2Cl_4 at 25°C yields N_2, CCl_2O, and polymer as exclusive products (36). The absence of $\dot{C}Cl_2CCl_2\dot{O}$ and $c\text{-}C_3Cl_6$ as products indicates respectively, that all the $C_2Cl_4O^*$ polymerizes and that none of the CCl_2 adds to C_2Cl_4; reaction 40 is not operative in this system. Since $-\Phi\{C_2Cl_4\} \sim 1$ the polymer does not incorporate additional CCl_2CCl_2, and its formation must come only from reaction 41.

$$CClXCX_2O^* \rightarrow Polymer \qquad 41$$

The mechanism predicts that

$$\Phi\{CCl_2O\} = k_{38a}/k_{2a} \qquad VII$$

$$-\Phi\{C_2Cl_4\} = 1 - k_{38a}/2k_{38} \qquad VIII$$

$\Phi\{CCl_2O\}$ was found to be 0.19 independent of reaction conditions, so this is the value of k_{38a}/k_{38}. With this value, $-\Phi\{C_2Cl_4\}$ should be 0.9, which is in agreement with the experimental results.

CCl_2CHCl: The products of the reaction were CO, $CHCl_3$ and polymer (37). The quantum yields of CO and $CHCl_3$ were 0.23 ± 0.01 and 0.14 ± 0.05 respectively. Thus the reaction channels involved in this system are reactions 38b and 38c, with $k_{38b}/k_{38} = 0.23$. Reaction 38b presumably proceeds through an energetic CHClO molecule which rapidly decomposed to HCl + CO. No CCl_2O was produced and the cleavage products gave entirely CCl_2, and no CHCl, diradicals. Most of the HCl and CCl_2 combine to form $CHCl_3$, but some other products must also be formed to account for the difference in the CO and $CHCl_3$ quantum yields.

Presumably $C_2HCl_3O^*$ always polymerizes, since no epoxide or aldehyde was found as products; and the polymerization must proceed without involving additional C_2HCl_3 molecules through reaction 41 since the quantum yield of C_2HCl_3 disappearance was about 1.0.

The mechanism predicts that:

$$\Phi\{CO\} = \Phi\{CHCl_3\} = k_{38b}/k_{38} \qquad \text{IX}$$

$$-\Phi\{C_2HCl_3\} = 1.0 \qquad \text{X}$$

The results of the oxidation of $CHClCCl_2$ in the three systems initiated by Cl atoms, Hg $6(^3P)$ and $O(^3P)$ are summarized in Table IV. The three systems give consistent findings.

CCl_2CH_2: The reaction of $O(^3P)$, prepared from the Hg photosensitization of N_2O, with CCl_2CH_2 was studied at 25°C (38). The products of the reaction were CO, $CH_2ClCCl(O)$, polymer and another unidentified compound. The quantum yields of CO and $CH_2ClCCl(O)$ were 0.35 and 0.06 respectively, independent of reaction conditions.

Table IV

Oxidation of $CClHCCl_2$

System	$\Phi\{CO\}/\Phi\{CCl_2O\}$	k_{2b}/k_2
Cl atom	--	0.09
Hg $6(^3P)$	1.85	0.16
$O(^3P)$	1.7	0.10

Twelve possible reaction paths between $O(^3P)$ and CCl_2CH_2 were discussed, the final conclusion gave the following mechanism as most likely (38).

$\phi = 0.31$	$O(^3P) + CCl_2CH_2 \rightarrow CO + HCl + CHCl$	38b'
$\phi = 0.55$	$\rightarrow CCl_2CH_2O^*$	38c
$\phi = 0.06$	$\rightarrow CH_2ClCCl(O)$	38d'
$\phi = 0.04$	$\rightarrow CHCl_2 + HCO$	38e
$\phi = 0.04$	$\rightarrow CH_2Cl + CO + Cl$	38e'

Reactions 38b', 38d', and 38c' are abnormal in that they involve the migration of a chlorine atom. The first two of these are particularly surprising, since the more usual analog involving hydrogen-atom migration apparently does not occur. The $CCl_2CH_2O^*$ formed in reaction 38c ultimately leads to polymer. Contrary to the situations with CCl_2CCl_2 and $CHClCCl_2$, some additional CH_2CCl_2 is incorporated into the polymer, since $-\phi\{CH_2CCl_2\}$ exceeds 1.0 and may be as high as 3.0.

<u>cis- and trans-CClHCClH</u>: The Hg-photosensitized decomposition of N_2O in the presence of cis or trans-CHClCHCl give N_2, CO and polymer as products (7). HCl was also detected at large conversions. Small amounts of $CH_2ClCCl(O)$ were found, but the quantum yield was ≤ 0.04. The average values for $\phi\{CO\}$ were 0.23 and 0.28 for the cis- and trans-CHClCHCl, respectively. Both isomers gave $-\phi\{CHClCHCl\}$ up to 5, indicating that the polymer consisted mainly of the chloroethylene.

The reaction goes through three channels:

$O(^3P) + CHClCHCl$	$\rightarrow CO + HCl + CClH$	38b
	$\rightarrow CHClCHClO^*$	38c
	$\rightarrow CH_2ClCCl(O)$	38d

followed by

$$CHClCHClO^* + CHClCHCl \rightarrow \text{polymer} \qquad 42$$

$$CClH + CHClCHCl \rightarrow \text{Products} \qquad 40'$$

$$2CHCl \rightarrow CHClCHCl \qquad 39$$

The fractional importance of channels 38b and 38d are given by $\Phi\{CO\}$ and $\Phi\{CH_2ClCCl(O)\}$, respectively. Thus $k_{38b}/k_{38} = 0.23$ for the cis isomer and 0.28 for the trans isomer. The ratio $k_{38d}/k_{38} \leq 0.04$.

<u>$CHClCH_2$</u>: The reaction of $O(^3P)$ with $CHClCH_2$ gives as products CO, $CH_2ClCH(O)$, $CH_3CCl(O)$, HCl, CH_4, and polymer (8). The quantum yields depend on the total pressure (mainly N_2O), and are given below for high and low pressure conditions.

<u>Product</u>	<u>$\Phi([N_2O] \simeq 400$ Torr)</u>	<u>$\Phi([N_2O] \simeq 35$ Torr)</u>
CO	0.25	0.40
$CH_2ClCH(O)$	0.40	0.25-0.35
$CH_3CCl(O)$	0.09	0.07

The quantum yield of $CHClCH_2$ removal exceeds 1.0, and it as well as $\Phi\{CH_3CCl(O)\}$ is independent of total pressure.

The reaction was explained by a scheme similar to that for the reaction of $O(^3P)$ with C_2H_4 (39) and which is substantially different from that for the other chloroolefins.

$$O(^3P) + C_2H_3Cl \rightarrow C_2H_3ClO^* \qquad 38c$$

$$C_2H_3ClO^* \rightarrow CH_2 + CO + HCl \qquad 43a$$

$$\rightarrow CH_2ClCH(O)^* \qquad 43b$$

$$\rightarrow CH_3CCl(O)^* \qquad 43b'$$

$$CH_2ClCH(O)^* \rightarrow CH_2Cl + HCO \qquad 44$$

$$CH_2ClCH(O)^* + M \rightarrow CH_2ClCH(O) + M \qquad 45$$

$$CH_3ClCH(O)^* \rightarrow CH_3 + Cl + CO \qquad 44'$$

$$CH_3CCl(O)^* + M \rightarrow CH_3CCl(O) + M \qquad 45'$$

The excited intermediate, $C_2H_3ClO^*$ can decompose or rearrange to one of the aldehydes which still contain the excess energy of reaction. If not

deactivated they decompose to radical fragments. Thus at higher pressure relatively more aldehydes and less CO are produced. The radical fragments react with the C_2H_3Cl to form the polymeric material. Presumably some of the CH_3 radicals abstract a hydrogen atom to give the small amount of CH_4 produced. Reaction 43a has been included for completeness, but in fact there is no evidence that it actually occurs. Apparently the $C_2H_3ClO^*$ is never deactivated to the epoxide, since no epoxide was found.

CH_2CH_2: The reaction of $O(^3P)$ with C_2H_4 has been interpreted traditionally (39) by the mechanism

$$O(^3P) + CH_2CH_2 \rightarrow CH_2CH_2O^* \qquad 38c'$$

$$CH_2CH_2O^* \rightarrow CH_3CHO^* \qquad 43b''$$

$$CH_2CH_2O^* + M \rightarrow \overline{CH_2CH_2O} + M \qquad 46$$

$$CH_3CHO^* \rightarrow CH_3 + HCO \qquad 44''$$

$$CH_3CHO^* + M \rightarrow CH_3CHO \qquad 45''$$

Most of the products could be interpreted as coming from the free radical fragments produced in reaction 44''. The yields of both $\overline{CH_2CH_2O}$ and CH_3CHO increased slightly with pressure indicating that they were produced, at least in part, from the pressure stabilization of the energetic intermediates. Further evidence for this comes from the work at liquid N_2 temperature where the sole products were $\overline{CH_2CH_2O}$ and $CH_3CH(O)$ in a ratio of 1.2 (40).

More recent experiments at room temperature utilizing crossed beams or a fast-flow reactor coupled to a photoionization mass spectrometer (41, 42) have confirmed the presence of a small additional process, accounting for 5% of the total reaction, to produce $CH_2CO + H_2$ directly as earlier suggested by Cvetanović (43, 44).

$$O(^3P) + CH_2CH_2 \rightarrow CH_2CO + H_2 \qquad 38f$$

CH_2CHBr: Slagle et al (45) have shown that three paths occur in the reaction of $O(^3P) + CH_2CHBr$:

$$O(^3P) + CH_2CHBr \rightarrow CH_3 + BrCO \rightarrow Br + CO \qquad 38a'$$

$$\rightarrow CH_2Br + HCO \qquad 38a''$$

$$\rightarrow CH_2CO + HBr \qquad 38f'$$

Reactions 38a' and 38a'' may proceed through energetic intermediate adducts. The relative importance of the three channels was 0.29, 0.51, and 0.21.

CF_2CF_2: Oxygen atoms react with C_2F_4 to produce CF_2O and $c\text{-}C_3F_6$ as exclusive products (1). The reaction was studied by Saunders and Heicklen (46) at temperatures of 23 and 125°C over a wide range of oxygen-atom concentrations and with C_2F_4 pressures from 3-123 torr. The quantum yield of CF_2O production is 1.0 for all conditions.

The mechanism of reaction is explained by

$$O(^3P) + CF_2CF_2 \rightarrow CF_2O + CF_2 \qquad 38a$$

$$\rightarrow C_2F_4O^* \qquad 38c$$

with channel 38c occurring 15% of the time. The CF_2 and $C_2F_4O^*$ are removed as follows:

$$2CF_2 \rightarrow C_2F_4 \qquad 39'$$

$$CF_2 + C_2F_4 \rightarrow c\text{-}C_3F_6 \qquad 40'$$

$$C_2F_4O^* \rightarrow CF_2O + CF_2 \qquad 41'$$

$$C_2F_4O^* + C_2F_4 \rightarrow CF_2O + c\text{-}C_3F_6 \qquad 42'$$

$C_2F_nH_{4-n}$ (n=1, 2 and 3): For the fluoroethylenes, there is not a complete study of the reaction mechanism.

Mitchell and Simons (47) studied the reaction of CH_2CF_2 through flash photolysis of NO_2 - olefin mixtures, and continuous photolysis of NO_2 - fluoroolefin mixtures. In the flash photolysis experiment ground state

CF_2 was monitored qualitatively from its U.V. absorption bands (which persist for > 60 msec.). Using C_2F_4 as a reference, Mitchell and Simons concluded that CF_2 is produced in large amounts in the CH_2CF_2 reaction when the $[CH_2CF_2]/[NO_2]$ ratio is high (to minimize the competition between NO_2 and CH_2CF_2 for the $O(^3P)$ atom).

The final products from continuous photolysis were: CO, C_2F_4, and very small amounts of CF_2O. It was concluded that reaction occurs via

$$O(^3P) + CH_2CF_2 \rightarrow CH_2O + CF_2 \qquad 38a$$

$$\rightarrow CF_2O + CH_2 \qquad 38a'$$

and that CH_2O was formed with sufficient vibrational energy to dissociate. Since no quantum yields were reported we can only tentatively outline a mechanism similar to that proposed for the chloroethylenes

$$O(^3P) + CH_2CF_2 \rightarrow CF_2O + CH_2 \qquad 38a'$$

$$\rightarrow CO + H_2 + CF_2 \qquad 38b$$

$$2CF_2 \rightarrow C_2F_4 \qquad 39'$$

It is interesting to point out that no $\overline{CF_2CH_2CF_2}$ was reported as a product.

For the same olefin both CF_2O and CH_2O were observed as products by Huie et al (48). However the authors pointed out that CF_2O could be from a secondary reaction with molecular oxygen in the reaction mixture.

In Table V are the aldehydic products reported by Huie et al (48) in the reaction of $O(^3P)$ with fluoroethylenes. No quantitative estimates were made.

Moss (49) reported that carbon monoxide is a primary product formed in high yields in the reaction of CH_2CHF with $O(^3P)$.

Table V

Products and quantum yields in the reaction of $O(^3P)$ with chloro-, chlorofluoro-, and fluoroethylenes

Haloethylene	Products[a]	ϕ[b]	k_{12a}/k_{12}	k_{12b}/k_{12}	k_{12c}/k_{12}	k_{12d}/k_{12}	k_{12e}/k_{12}	References
CCl_2CCl_2	CCl_2O and Polymer	0.19	0.19	0	0.81	0	0	Senhuesa and Heicklen (36)
CCl_2CClH	CO, $CHCl_3$, and Polymer	0.23	0	0.23	0.77	0	0	Senhuesa and Heicklen (37)
CCl_2CH_2	CO, $CH_2ClCCl(O)$ and Polymer	0.35	0	0.31[c]	0.55	0.06[c]	0.08[d]	Senhuesa and Heicklen (38)
cis-CClHCClH	CO, HCl and Polymer	0.23	0	0.23	0.73-0.77	$\leq$0.04	0	Senhuesa and Heicklen (7)
trans-CClHCClH	CO, HCl and Polymer	0.28	0	0.28	0.68-0.72	$\leq$0.04	0	Senhuesa and Heicklen (7)
$CClHCH_2$	$CH_2ClCH(O)$, CO, $CH_2CCl(O)$ and Polymer	$\leq$0.4	0	$\leq$0.25	>0.30	0.09-0.34		Senhuesa and Heicklen (8)
CF_2CF_2	CF_2O and c-C_3F_6	1.0	0.85	0	0.15	0	0	Senhuesa and Heicklen (46)
CF_2CFCl	CF_2O	1.0						Senhuesa (18)
CFClCFCl	CFClO and Polymer	0.80	0.80	0	0.20	0	0	Senhuesa and Heicklen (9)
CF_2CCl_2	CF_2O and $\dot{C}Cl_2CF_2\dot{C}Cl_2$	1.0	0	0	1.00	0	0	Senhuesa and Heicklen (9)
CF_2CFH	CF_2O, CHFO	--						Huie et al (48)
CF_2CH_2	CO, C_2F_4, CF_2O	--						Mitchell and Simons (47)
CF_2CHCl	CF_2O, CO, HCl	--						Mitchell and Simons (47)
CF_2CFBr	CF_2O	--						Mitchell and Simons (47)
CH_2CHF	CHFO, CH_2O and CO	--						Huie et al (48) and Niki (49)
CFHCFH	CHFO	--						Huie et al (48)

a) For more details see text.
b) Quantum yield of the principal oxygenated product (first listed in Products column). $\phi = k_{12a}/k_{12}$ (where x = a,b,c, or d).
c) These yields are for the abnormal reactions involving Cl atom migration (see text).
d) Total yield = 0.08. About 1/2 of the yield involves the normal H atom migration; and about 1/2 of the yield, the abnormal Cl atom migration (see text).

CFClCFCl: Sanhueza and Heicklen (9) reported on the Hg-photosensitized decomposition of N_2O in the presence of an equilibrium mixture of cis- and trans-CFClCFCl. The products were N_2, CFClO, polymer, and an unidentified compound. $\Phi\{CFClO\}$ was ~ 0.80 independent of a factor of 6.7 change in [CFClCFCl] and a factor of 14 change in I_a (at high N_2O pressures). The values for $-\Phi\{CFClCFCl\}$ showed some scatter, and they varied between 1.0 and 3.4, suggesting that more than one CFClCFCl is removed per $O(^3P)$. The unidentified product was probably cyclo-$(CFCl)_3$ and its relative yield showed no trend with changes in reaction conditions.

The reaction is most easily described by the mechanism:

$$O(^3P) + CFClCFCl \rightarrow CFClO + CFCl \qquad 38a$$

$$\rightarrow CFClCFClO^* \qquad 38c$$

$$2CFCl \rightarrow CFClCFCl \qquad 39$$

$$CFCl + CFClCFCl \rightarrow \text{cyclo-}(CFCl)_3 \qquad 40$$

$$CFClCFClO^* + CFClCFCl \rightarrow \text{Polymer} \qquad 42$$

with the ratio $k_{38a}/k_{38} = 0.80$.

CF_2CCl_2: The reaction of $O(^3P)$ with CF_2CCl_2 gives CF_2O and $\overline{CCl_2CF_2CCl_2}$, both with quantum yields of about unity and with $-\Phi\{CF_2CCl_2\} = 2$ invariant to reaction conditions (9). The mechanism consistent with the other chloroolefins was discarded for the following reasons:

1) No C_2Cl_4 was found.

2) $\Phi\{\overline{CCl_2CF_2CCl_2}\}$ should be pressure dependent and intensity dependent unless reaction 39 never occurs.

3) In the presence of O_2 (discussed in the next section) the long-chain free-radical oxidation should occur and $\Phi\{CF_2ClCCl(O)\}$ should approach 45. In fact it never reaches 3.0.

4. In the presence of O_2, the long-chain oxidation should be a function of $[CF_2CCl_2]/I_a^{1/2}$. In fact $\Phi\{CF_2ClCCl(O)\}$ is independent of I_a, but dependent on $[CF_2CCl_2]/[O_2]$. Thus, Sanhueza and Heicklen (9) proposed the following mechanism:

$$O(^3P) + CF_2CCl_2 \rightarrow CCl_2CF_2O^* \qquad 38c$$

$$CCl_2CF_2O^* + CF_2CCl_2 \rightarrow CF_2O + \overline{CCl_2CF_2CCl_2} \qquad 42'$$

This mechanism predicts that

$$\Phi\{CF_2O\} = \Phi\{\overline{CCl_2CF_2CCl_2}\} = 1.0 \qquad XI$$

which conformed to the findings.

In Mitchell and Simons (47) system (discussed above) no CF_2 was produced from CF_2CCl_2 in their flash photolysis experiments and CCl_2O was the main product from continuous photolysis. Tyerman (50), who looked for ground-state CF_2 by kinetic spectroscopy after long wavelength flash photolysis of CF_2CCl_2-NO_2-N_2 mixtures reported that no CF_2 diradical is released from the reaction.

<u>CF_2CFCl</u>: In the reaction of $O(^3P)$ with CF_2CFCl, Mitchell and Simons (47) reported CF_2O and CFClO as products, the former being the more important. In their experiments with O_2 present, $[CF_2O] \simeq [CFClO]$, so it is possible that the small amount of CFClO detected in the absence of O_2 really came from the reaction with O_2 produced in the reaction of $O(^3P)$ with NO_2.

Preliminary results from our laboratory (18) show that the production of CF_2O has a quantum yield of 1.0, in agreement with Tyerman (50) who reported that no CF_2 was released from the reaction.

<u>Mechanism</u>:

The results of the various studies are summarized in Table V. Some general comments are:

1) There are three types of reactions which are most typified by the three molecules C_2F_4, C_2Cl_4, and C_2H_4. For C_2F_4 the main result of $O(^3P)$ attack is double bond cleavage, reaction 38a; for C_2Cl_4, the principal reaction path is 38c to form $CCl_2CCl_2O^*$ which then polymerizes all the time; for C_2H_4, the excited intermediate, $CH_2CH_2O^*$, is also formed, but it rearranges to give CH_3CHO or free-radical fragments. There is also some evidence that these products are formed directly via reaction paths 38d and 38e. Mono free radicals or the 2-carbon acid halide are never formed with C_2F_4 or C_2Cl_4.

For the fluoroethylenes, $CHFCF_2$, $CHFCHF$, CH_2CF_2, $CHFCH_2$, CF_2CFCl, and CF_2CFBr, the data are not quantitative. However no polymer, epoxide, 2-carbon carbonyl product,or products expected from mono-free-radicals were found. Consequently we can assume that the principal reaction path is by carbon-carbon double-bond cleavage, either reaction 38a or 38b.

C_2F_4 and $CFClCFCl$ react with $O(^3P)$ primarily by the double-bond cleavage reaction 38a, but some excited intermediate is produced by channel 38c. CF_2CCl_2 apparently reacts entirely by channel 38c. For C_2F_4 and CF_2CCl_2, the excited intermediate $CX_2CX_2O^*$ always reacts with the parent olefin to give a short-chain polymerization (chain lengths < 10).

With all the chloroolefins the C=C double-bond cleavage paths, reactions 38a and 38b occur 19-31% of the time. The dominant path is reaction 38c to produce $CClXCX_2O^*$. This molecule leads entirely to polymerizerization without involving the parent olefin with C_2Cl_4 and $CHClCCl_2$

$$CClXCX_2O^* \rightarrow \text{Polymer} \qquad 41$$

$CClXCX_2O^*$ leads almost entirely to polymer for the CH_2CCl_2 and cis- and trans-$CHClCHCl$ systems, either by reaction 41 or by incorporation of the parent molecule

$CClXCX_2O^* + CClXCX_2 \cdot$ Polymer 42

$CClXCX_2O^*$ leads primarily to rearrangement for the $CHClCH_2$ and C_2H_4 systems. Thus the 2-carbon carbonyl products and the products of mono-free-radical reactions are observed. In C_2H_4 some epoxide is also observed, but this is the only ethylene for which the epoxide was ever reported.

2) It has been seen that except for C_2H_4, no epoxide has ever been found. Furthermore, except for C_2H_4, CH_2CHBr, $CHClCH_2$, to a minor extent CCl_2CH_2, and cis- and trans-CHClCHCl, no free-radical or rearrangement products were found. This suggests that with the exception of C_2H_4, CH_2CHBr, and $CHClCH_2$, the excited $CX_2CX_2O^*$ intermediate has a σ type bond with the oxygen atom localized on one of the carbon atoms, presumably the one at the positive end of the molecule.



Thus this molecule has diradical character (from the spin conservation rules, it should be a triplet) and reacts easily with the parent olefin or with itself. Presumably for C_2H_4 and $CHClCH_2$, the oxygen atom is more centrally located, as has been postulated by Cvetanović (39).



Thus for these molecules probably the excited intermediates are the triplet states of the corresponding epoxides.

3) For the unsymmetrical chloroethylenes, the $O(^3P)$ atoms always preferentially attack the less chlorinated carbon atom. The same effect was seen with chlorine atom attack, and the reason must be steric, rather than due to inductive or mesomeric effects.

In fluoroethylenes, since two carbonyl products are reported, both sides are attacked. However Mitchell and Simons (47) reported that in CF_2CH_2 the production of CF_2 was very low and that the main product was CO (probably from $CH_2O^* \rightarrow CO$). Maybe, in this case the strong mesomeric effect of the fluorine in the molecule is the explanation



Moss (49) reported that CO is also produced in large amounts in the reaction of CH_2CHF with $O(^3P)$. In the CF_2CFBr-$O(^3P)$ system the main product was CF_2O (47) in agreement with the idea that steric effects dominate in the addition. Haszeldine and Steele (51) concluded that atom or free-radical attack on CF_2CFCl occurs exclusively at the CF_2 group.

Johari et al (52) in their paper on addition of CF_2 to chloroolefins concluded that, "If the rate of attack at the $-CF_2$ end of difluoroethylene is assumed to be approximately the same as that for addition to the $-CF_2$ end of chloro-2,2-difluoroethylene then the rate of attack at a CHCl group is estimated to be 10^3 to 10^4 times slower than attack at the $-CH_2$ group."

Rate Coefficient:

The rate coefficient for many ethylenes have been measured at room temperature. When the $O(^3P)$ atoms are produced from Hg photosensitization of N_2O, it is most convenient to measure the competition between two olefins for the $O(^3P)$ atom. From the variation in the product yields with relative pressure, the relative rate coefficient can be obtained. If the rate coefficient for one olefin is known, the other can be computed.

Huie et al (48) measured their rate coefficients using a discharge-flow system coupled to a mass spectrometer by monitoring the decay of the olefin.

Table VI

Rate coefficient for the reaction of atomic oxygen with haloethylenes at room temperature[a]

Olefin	$k/k\{C_2H_4\}$	Source of $O(^3P)$ atom	Reference
CH_2CHF	0.51	microwave discharge	Huie et al (48)
	0.38	$N_2O + Hg^*$	Moss (49)
CH_2CF_2	0.43	microwave discharge	Huie et al (48)
	0.22	$N_2O + Hg^*$	Moss (49)
cis-CHFCHF	0.32	$N_2O + Hg^*$	Moss (49)
trans-CHFCHF	0.54	$N_2O + Hg^*$	Moss (49)
CHFCHF	0.52	microwave discharge	Huie et al (48)
$CHFCF_2$	0.57	$N_2O + Hg^*$	Moss (49)
CF_2CF_2	1.0	$N_2O + Hg^*$	Saunders and Heicklen (46)
	1.0	$NO_2 + h\nu$	Tyerman (50)
	1.6	$N_2O + Hg^*$	Moss (49)
CH_2CHCl	1.0	microwave discharge	Huie et al (48)
CH_2CCl_2	1.0	$N_2O + Hg^*$	Sanhueza and Heicklen (38)
cis-CHClCHCl	0.47	$N_2O + Hg^*$	Sanhueza and Heicklen (7)
trans-CHClCHCl	0.11	$N_2O + Hg^*$	Sanhueza and Heicklen (7)
$CHClCCl_2$	0.10	$N_2O + Hg^*$	Sanhueza and Heicklen (37)
CCl_2CCl_2	0.10	$N_2O + Hg^*$	Sanhueza and Heicklen (36)
CF_2CFCl	0.51	$NO_2 + h\nu$	Tyerman (50)
CF_2CCl_2	0.67	$NO_2 + h\nu$	Tyerman (50)
CFClCFCl	0.20	$N_2O + Hg^*$	Sanhueza and Heicklen (9)
CH_2CHBr	0.78	crossed beams	Slagle et al (45)
	1.0	microwave discharge	Huie et al (48)

a) $k\{C_2H_4\} = (4.0 \pm 0.1) \times 10^8 \underline{M}^{-1}sec^{-1}$ at 25°C (53-59).

In the technique used by Tyerman (50), ground state CF_2 was monitored by kinetic spectroscopy after the long wavelength photolysis of NO_2 (to produce $O(^3P)$) in the presence of C_2F_4 and a competitive olefin diluted in N_2. The CF_2 was produced in the $O(^3P)$-C_2F_4 reaction, and its diminution in the competitive system gave a measure of the relative rate coefficient.

The results of the different studies are listed in Table VI. Rates relative to C_2H_4 are reported. For C_2H_4 the room-temperature rate coefficient is $4.0 \pm 0.1 \times 10^8$ M^{-1} sec^{-1} (53-59). The rate coefficients for C_2H_4, C_2F_4, CH_2CHCl, and CH_2CCl_2 are equal to each other and greater than the rate coefficients for the other substituted ethylenes. The partially fluorinated ethylenes have rate coefficient 1/3 - 2/3 that of C_2H_4. The presence of chlorine on both carbon atoms (except for cis-CHClCHCl) drops the rate to about 0.1 that for C_2H_4.

Moss (49) pointed out that, "In considering the reactivities of atoms or free radicals, it is usual to seek correlation with observed or calculated properties of the reactant molecules. Successful correlation often provides useful indication of the nature of the radical reactants and the main factor controlling reactivity. The rates of reaction of $O(^3P)$ with hydrocarbon olefin correlates well with excitation energies and ionization potential of the olefin (39). Since these properties show the ease with which an electron may be removed or promoted from the π-orbital of the ground-state molecule, electrophilic behaviour of $O(^3P)$ is indicated." These observations, and others, have led Cvetanović to suggest that the transition state for the reaction is a π-complex with the oxygen atom placed approximately centrally between the carbon atoms forming the double bond.

Moss (49) measured the relative rate constant for the reaction of oxygen atoms with the fluorinated ethylenes. The results (in Table VI) were compared with data for other atoms and radicals with the same olefins,

and briefly discussed in terms of the electronic changes produced in the double bond by fluorine substitution. The $O(^3P)$ reactivities showed no correlation with the ionization potential.

The reactivities of the chlorinated ethylenes show a correlation between the reactivities with $O(^3P)$ and the ionization potentials. The rate of reaction decreases (more chlorinated) as the ionization potential decreases. However this correlation is in the opposite direction of that if $O(^3P)$ is an electrophilic species. The results for oxygen atoms are compared in Table VII with results for other atoms and radicals adding to chloro- and chlorofluoroethylenes. Always C_2Cl_4 is the least reactive and in a general way the inclusion of chlorine in the olefinic molecule decreases the rate.

cis-CClHCClH reacts faster than the trans isomer in the $O(^3P)$ reaction. The significant difference for the rate coefficients for the two isomers presumably reflects steric factor differences.

It is interesting to note that, for the reaction of $O(^3P)$ with CHFCHF and C_4H_8-2, the rate coefficient is also larger for the trans compounds than for the cis compounds by respective factors of 1.7 (49) and 1.6 (60). However the reactions of CH_3O listed in Table VII show that the cis isomer reacts faster with CH_3O than does the trans isomer.

REACTION WITH $O(^3P)$ IN THE PRESENCE OF O_2

The oxidation of the halogenated ethylenes by $O(^3P)$ atoms in the presence of O_2 may proceed by three different routes:

1) A chain mechanism initiated by the oxidation of the substituted methylene, CX_2. This process is important for C_2Cl_4, $CHClCCl_2$, CH_2CCl_2, cis- and trans-CFClCHCl, CFClCFCl, and C_2F_4.

Table VII

Relative reactivities of chloro- and chlorofluoroethylenes with atoms and radicals in the gas phase at room temperature[a]

Ethylene	$O(^3P)$[b]	CCl_3[c]	CH_3O[d]	Cl[e]	Hg $6(^3P)$	Ionization Potential, eV[f]
			Chloroethylenes			
CCl_2Cl_2	0.10	<0.003	0.18	0.30[g]	1.7[h]	9.34
CCl_2CHCl	0.10	0.16	0.40	0.79	2.3[i]	9.48
CCl_2CH_2	1.0	--	--	0.72	--	9.83
cis-CClHCClH	0.11	0.05	1.28	1.37	--	9.65
trans-CClHCClH	0.47		0.95	0.90	--	9.64
$CClHCH_2$	1.0	1.0[g]	--	1.0[j]	--	10.00
CH_2CH_2	1.0[j]	--	1.0[j]	--	1.0[j]	10.66
			Chlorofluoroethylenes			
CF_2CF_2	1.0	--	2.22	--	0.20[k]	10.11
CF_2CFCl	0.51	--	--	--	--	9.84
CF_2CCl_2	0.67	0.06	--	--	--	9.65
CFClCFCl	0.20	--	--	--	--	--

a) A very complete table is given by Moss (49) for the fluoroethylenes.
b) For References see Table V.
c) Reference 52 at 150°C.
d) Reference 61.
e) Reference 63.
f) Reference 62.
g) Reference 23.
h) References 27, 29.
i) Reference 29.
j) Relative reactivity set at 1.0.
k) References 1, 29.

2) The oxidation of the $CX_2CX_2O^*$ intermediate. This process is important for C_2F_4, CF_2CCl_2, and $CHClCH_2$.

3) The oxidation of the mono-free-radical fragments, a process of importance in C_2H_4 and $CHClCH_2$.

Methylene Oxidation:

Dependent on the parent ethylene, the $O(^3P)$ atom can react with it to produce any of the following methylenes: CCl_2, CH_2, CF_2, CClH, CClF, or CFH. The spin conservation rules predict that these methylenes will be produced in their triplet states and thus be reactive with O_2. This is to be contrasted for the singlet carbene species, which have been shown to be unreactive with O_2 at room temperature for CH_2 (64), CCl_2 (65), CFCl (65), and CF_2 (1) (singlet CF_2 reacts with O_2 at elevated temperatures to give $CF_2O + O(^3P)$).

All the evidence suggests that when CX_2 species are produced in the $O(^3P)$-CX_2CX_2 reaction, they are produced exclusively in the triplet state. However the triplet methylenes react with O_2 by three different routes depending on the methylene involved.

1) The triplet species CCl_2 (36,37), CClH (7) and CClF (9) react with O_2 as follows

$$^3CClX + O_2 \rightarrow XO + ClCO \qquad 46$$

and the ClCO species can rapidly fall apart

$$ClCO \rightarrow Cl + CO$$

2) The triplet CF_2 adds to O_2 (1)

$$^3CF_2 + O_2 \rightarrow CF_2O_2 \qquad 24$$

3) The triplet CH_2 gives (43)

$$^3CH_2 + O_2 \rightarrow HCOOH \qquad 47a$$

$$H_2O + CO \qquad 47b$$

Thus in the first case mono-free-radicals are produced; in the second case, diradicals; and in the third case, stable products. The detailed fate of triplet CFH with O_2 is unknown, but Gordon and Lin (66) observed HF laser emission from the reaction of CHF with O_2. They attributed this product to the formation of excited FCOOH which decomposes to give $HF^* + CO_2$. Thus, at least part of the time, CHF oxidizes analogously to CH_2 to give molecular products directly.

The difference in the three reactions is probably energetics. In all likelihood in all three cases the adduct CX_2O_2 is formed first. With CF_2O_2, any rearrangement is endothermic and does not occur. For the other species presumably they rearrange to $XC\overset{O}{\underset{OX}{<}}$, which decomposes to XO + XCO. Only in the case of $HC\overset{O}{\underset{OH}{<}}$ does stabilization occur. However the $HC\overset{O}{\underset{OH}{<}}$ initially formed on rearrangement contains excess energy, and apparently this energy is sufficient for reaction 47b to proceed if the molecule is not deenergized.

Oxidation of $CX_2CX_2O^*$:

The reaction of $CX_2CX_2O^*$ with O_2 can proceed in two ways. The route which predominates with $CF_2CF_2O^*$ is:

$$O_2 + CF_2CF_2O^* \rightarrow CF_2O + CF_2O$$

On the other hand, with $CCl_2CF_2O^*$, the process is

$$O_2 + CCl_2CF_2O^* \rightarrow CF_2O + ClCO + Cl$$

$CHClCH_2O^*$ apparently can react by either route to produce the diradical or monoradical products, respectively. For the other ethylenes, the oxidation of $CHClCH_2O^*$ has not been elucidated, since it appears to be an unimportant process.

Individual Molecules:

C_2Cl_4: A long-chain process is involved which produces the same products as in the chlorine-atom initiated reaction, and the ratio of CCl_3CClO produced

to CCl_2O produced is 2.0 at 25°C (36), similar to the ratio of 2.5 found in the chlorine atom system. However the rate law is different, the quantum yield of chlorinated product formation being proportional to $[C_2Cl_4]/I_a^{1/2}$. In addition CO is formed with a quantum yield of 0.18, independent of conditions. This value is identical to the CCl_2O yield in the $O(^3P)$-C_2Cl_4 system in the absence of O_2.

CHClCCl$_2$: For $CHClCCl_2$ the free-radical long-chain oxidation is observed, as in the case of CCl_4 (37). The chain lengths increase with $[CHClCCl_2]/I_a^{1/2}$, but at a less than a linear rate.

CHClCHCl: Again the free-radical long-chain is observed (7). However the chain length is almost independent of $[CHClCHCl]/I_a^{1/2}$ for the trans-compound and only slightly dependent on this parameter for the cis-compound. Geometrical isomerization is also observed.

CH_2CCl_2: The free-radical long-chain process occurs, and the chain lengths increase with $[CH_2CCl_2]/I_a^{1/2}$, but less than proportionately (38). Thus the rate law is similar to that for $CHClCCl_2$. The CO quantum yield increases from 0.15 in the absence of O_2 to 0.78 ± 0.16 in the presence of O_2, independent of reaction conditions.

CFClCFCl: As with $CHClCCl_2$ and CH_2CCl_2, this molecule exhibits the free-radical long-chain oxidation which increases less than proportionately with $[CFClCFCl]/I_a^{1/2}$ (9). The quantum yield of oxidation reaches an upper limiting value of 140. CO was also produced with a quantum yield of 0.80, exactly equal to the CFClO yield in the $O(^3P)$-CFClCFCl system in the absence of O_2.

CF_2CCl_2: In this system a short-chain process was observed which did not depend on $[CF_2CCl_2]/I_a^{1/2}$, but rather on $[CF_2CCl_2]/[O_2]$. $\Phi\{CF_2O\}$ was equal to 1.0 invariant to the reaction parameters (9). These results

were interpreted by a mechanism analogous to that found for C_2F_4 (1):

$$CCl_2CF_2O^* + CF_2CCl_2 \rightarrow CF_2O + \overline{CCl_2CF_2CCl_2} \quad 48$$

$$CCl_2CF_2O^* + O_2 \rightarrow CF_2O + ClO + ClCO \quad 49$$

Reaction 49 becomes the initiating step for the chain reaction, and the mechanism predicts $\Phi\{CF_2ClCCl(O)\}/\Phi\{CO\}$ in this system should equal $\Phi\{CF_2ClCCl(O)\}$ in the chlorine-atom initiated oxidation at high pressures. The former quantity varies between 28 and 45, and the latter quantity is about 45, so that the agreement is not too bad.

Reactions 48 and 49 must be simplifications of a much more complex process since they predict $\Phi\{CO\} = 1.0$ and $\Phi\{\overline{CCl_2CF_2CCl_2}\} = 0$ at low values of $[CF_2CCl_2]/[O_2]$, and $\Phi\{CO\} = 0$ and $\Phi\{\overline{CCl_2CF_2CCl_2}\} = 1.0$ at high values of $[CF_2CCl_2]/[O_2]$, contrary to the observations. Possibly $CCl_2CF_2O^*$ represents several isomeric species, one of which always goes by reaction 48, one of which always goes by reaction 49, and one or more which can proceed by either route.

C_2F_4: The reaction of oxygen atoms with C_2F_4 in the presence of O_2 was studied briefly by Saunders and Heicklen (46) at room temperature and in more detail at 23 and 125°C by Heicklen and Knight (67). In addition to CF_2O and c-C_3F_6 (found in the absence of O_2) the products included tetrafluoroethylene oxide ($\overline{CF_2CF_2O}$). The results were reviewed and discussed elsewhere (1). The results were explained by a biradical mechanism which for the methylene is

$$^1CF_2 + O_2 \rightarrow CF_2O_2 \quad 24$$

$$CF_2O_2 + C_2F_4 \rightarrow 2CF_2O + {}^1CF_2 \quad 23a$$

$$\rightarrow CF_2O + \overline{CF_2CF_2O} \quad 23b$$

$$2CF_2O_2 \rightarrow 2CF_2O + O_2 \quad 50$$

and for the excited molecule mechanism is

$$C_2F_4O^* + C_2F_4 \rightarrow c\text{-}C_3F_6 + CF_2O \quad 42'$$

$C_2F_3O^* + O_2 \rightarrow CF_2O + CF_2O_2$ 51

$CHClCH_2$: Vinyl chloride is unique among the chloroolefins and does not oxidize like any of the higher homologs. Its oxidation follows more nearly the pattern of C_2F_4 except that there is no chain in the $O(^3P)$-O_2-$CHClCH_2$ system; the products are CHClO, CO, HCl, and HCOOH (8).

Also a very surprising result occurs, namely no C_2 carbonyl compounds are produced. The O_2 must intercept the intermediate in a scheme such as

$$C_2H_2ClO^* + O_2 \rightarrow CHClO^* + CH_2O_2 \quad 51a'$$

$$\rightarrow HCl + CO + CH_2O_2 \quad 51b'$$

The CH_2O_2 can either rearrange to HCOOH or decompose to $CO + H_2O$

$$CH_2O_2 \rightarrow HCOOH \quad 52a$$

$$\rightarrow CO + H_2O \quad 52b$$

From the data it was difficult to assess the relative importance of the products observed. However a reasonable designation for the initial quantum yields was

$$\Phi(CO) \sim 0.6$$

$$\Phi(HCOOH) \sim 0.85$$

$$\Phi(CHClO) \sim 0.6$$

With this assessment, $k_{51a'}/k_{51} \sim 0.6$ and $k_{51a}/k_{52} \sim 0.8$.

Rate Law:

There are two general rate laws:

1) The diradical mechanism which involves the oxidation of CX_2 and $CX_2CX_2O^*$. If there is a chain (C_2F_4, CF_2CCl_2) the chain lengths are dependent on the ratio $[CX_2CX_2]/[O_2]$. The rate law has been discussed in detail in C_2F_4 elsewhere (1).

2) The monoradical chain mechanism which applies to all the chloroolefins studied, except CF_2CCl_2 and $CHClCH_2$. The chain lengths depend on the parameter $[CClXCX_2]/I_a^{1/2}$ when the $O(^3P)$ atom is generated in steady-state

photolysis. Since the rate of the chain propagation step is proportional to $[CClXCX_2]$, termination by a radical-radical mechanism is suggested in which one radical is the chain carrier (i.e. Cl atoms) and the other radical must be one that is absent in the chlorine-atom initiated or Hg-photosensitized oxidations, since in those systems there is no intensity dependence. The indicated reactions are

$$Cl + XCO \rightarrow ClX + CO \qquad 53$$

$$ClO + ClCO \rightarrow Cl_2O + CO \qquad 54a$$

$$\rightarrow Cl_2 + CO_2 \qquad 54b$$

The initiating reactions are:

$$^1CCl_2 + O_2 \rightarrow ClO + ClCO \qquad 46'$$

$$^1CClH + O_2 \rightarrow HO + ClCO \qquad 46''$$

$$^3CClF + O_2 \rightarrow FO + ClCO \qquad 46'''$$

and the ClCO can decompose via

$$ClCO \rightarrow Cl + CO$$

The ClO and HO radicals react rapidly with the olefins to initiate the chain. However the FO radical is apparently a terminating radical, since in the CFClCFCl system, the chain length was only one-half that expected if FO propagated the chain.

If the termination is principally by reactions 53 and 54, which is the case at low values of $[CClXCX_2]/I_a^{1/2}$, then the oxidation chain length will be proportional to $[CClXCX_2]/I_a^{1/2}$. On the other hand at high values of $[CClXCX_2]/I_a^{1/2}$, termination is principally by reactions 4b and 4b'. The chain length should be independent of the reaction parameters, and should be equal to that in the chlorine-atom initiated system multiplied by the yield of CXCl radicals produced in the primary step when $O(^3P)$ reacts with $CClXCX_2$ (1/2 that value for CFClCFCl, since FO is not a propagating radical). Thus

$$\Phi\{OX\}_{\infty}/\Phi\{OX\}_{Cl} = (k_{3a} + k_{3b})/k_{3} \qquad \text{XII}$$

where $\Phi\{OX\}_{\infty}$ is the upper limiting oxidation quantum yield at high $[CClXCX_2]/I_a$ in the $O(^3P)$-O_2-$CClXCX_2$ system, and $\Phi\{OX\}_{Cl}$ is the oxidation yield in the chlorine-atom initiated oxidation. The right-hand side of eqn. XII also can be obtained independently from the $O(^3P)$-$CClXCX_2$ system in the absence of O_2. Thus eqn. XII relates, in one expression, the principal features of the chlorine-atom initiated oxidation, the $O(^3P)$ oxidation, and $O(^3P)$-O_2-CX_2ClCX_2 oxidation.

Table VIII summarizes the results obtained for the upper limit long-chain oxidation in the $O(^3P)$-O_2-$CClXCX_2$ system. The values of $\Phi\{OX\}_{\infty}/\Phi\{OX\}_{Cl}$ agree quite well with the values of $(k_{3a} + k_{3b})/k_{3}$ obtained in the absence of O_2.

REACTIONS WITH OZONE

Surprisingly, in spite of their commercial importance and possible biological significance of some of the haloethylenes, relatively limited kinetic studies have been carried out on the ozonolysis reactions of these compounds. The earliest work appears to be as recent as 1966 (68) and, apparently, subsequent studies have originated only from Cvetanović and coworkers at the Canadian National Research Council (69) and from our laboratory (5, 70, 71). The former group reported on the kinetics of ozonolysis of various chloroethylenes in CCl_4 solution while our investigations have dealt with the gas phase and the low temperature solid phase reactions of several of the same chloroethylenes. Although some of our studies have not yet been published, the important conclusions resulting from them will be reviewed here. Also, for the sake of completeness, the ozonolysis data on ethylene itself will be included in this review.

Table VIII

The Reaction of chloroethylenes with $O(^3P)$ in the presence of O_2

Olefin	$[Olefin]/I_a^{1/2}$, $(Torr\text{-}sec)^{1/2}$	$[Olefin]/I_a^{1/2}$ Dependence	$\Phi(CO)$	$\Phi(OX)_\infty$	$\frac{\Phi(OX)_\infty}{\Phi(OX)_{Cl}}$ [a]	$\frac{k_{23a} + k_{23b}}{k_{23}}$ [b]	Reference
CCl_2CCl_2	9.9 - 175	linear	0.18	c	--	0.19	Sanhueza and Heicklen (36)
CCl_2CHCl	48 - 1150	less than linear	d	77.0	0.38	0.23	Sanhueza and Heicklen (37)
CCl_2CH_2	94 - 2000	less than linear	0.78[e]	55.0	0.32	0.35	Sanhueza and Heicklen (38)
cis-CHClCHCl	36.5 - 687	almost none	d	7.0	0.32	0.23	Sanhueza and Heicklen (7)
trans-CHClCHCl	32.5 - 638	almost none	d	7.0	0.32	0.28	Sanhueza and Heicklen (7)
CFClCFCl	40.5 - 684	less than linear	0.80	160	0.76 (0.38 x 2)	0.80	Sanhueza and Heicklen (9)

a) $\Phi(OX)_{Cl}$ from Table I.
b) Values obtained when O_2 was absent (Table V).
c) Was never reached under the actual experimental condition.
d) CO was also produced in the chain.
e) $\Phi(CO) = 0.35$ in the absence of O_2.

Review of the Experimental Data

C_2H_4: The reaction of ethylene with ozone has been studied in the vapor phase under chemiluminescent conditions by Finlayson, et al (72, 73), and under non-chemiluminescent conditions by several research groups (74-83). Experimental data for the liquid phase reaction originate from the laboratories of Cvetanović (84) and of Kuczkowski (85-88). We have reported previously on the reaction carried out in the solid phase at low temperatures (88) and on the vapor phase decomposition of one of the relatively stable reaction products obtained from the liquid and solid phase reactions (89).

In their study of the chemiluminescent reaction, Finlayson et al. (72, 73) employed a flow system in which excess olefin reacted with ozone (about 2 mole percent diluted in O_2, N_2, or He). The total pressures were 2-10 Torr. Emission was seen from vibration-rotation bands of HO with $v \geq 3$. The emission was virtually identical to the Meinel bands seen from the reaction of H with O_3

$$H + O_3 \rightarrow O_2 + HO^{*} \quad (v \geq 9) \qquad 55$$

thus confirming that H atoms are produced under the experimental conditions used. The emission yield was $\sim 10^{-3}$ for the $9 \rightarrow 3$ transition per molecule of reactant consumed at 4.6 Torr total pressure. Also seen was emission from electronically excited CH_2O ($A'' \rightarrow {}^1A_1$) and OH ($A^2\Sigma \rightarrow X^2\Pi$), the yield of the former emission being $\sim 10^{-3}$ per molecule of reactant consumed. The electronically excited HO emission was seen only in N_2-buffered mixtures, but the other two emissions were seen in either N_2 or O_2 buffered mixtures. With the assumption of 1:1 reactant stoichiometry, the rate coefficient was found to be 5 times larger in N_2 than in O_2 at 2-10 Torr total pressure and reactant fractions of $O_3 \sim 50$ ppm and $C_2H_4 \sim 400$ ppm. In O_2 the rate coefficient at room temperature was $(1 \pm 1) \times 10^3$ $\underline{M}^{-1}$ sec^{-1}.

Cadle and Schadt (74) appear to have been the first to study quantitatively the kinetics of the ethylene-ozone reaction. Infrared spectroscopy was used to follow the decay of ozone, and the reactant pressures were in the range of 0.1 to 3 Torr. The consumption ratio $[C_2H_4]/[O_3]$ was reported to vary between 1.9 and 3.2 and the products were not identified. The initial rates, which were first order in each reactant, gave a second order rate constant of 2.1×10^3 $\underline{M}^{-1}$ sec^{-1}. Evidently, the rate showed no dependence on oxygen pressure (150 to 650 Torr) or on temperature (30° to 50°C).

The second order kinetics was subsequently confirmed by Hanst et al (75), by Bufalini and Altshuller (79), by DeMore (80), and by others (82, 83). Bufalini and Altshuller (79) used in their work a 12-liter static reactor kept at 25°C and under a dynamic condition a variable volume vessel (0.5 to 12 liter) with temperature kept between 30° and 100°C. Reactant concentrations were in the parts per million range and air was used as diluent. Ethylene was analyzed by gas chromatography while the iodide titration method was used for ozone. Complete stoichiometry was not reported but the consumption ratio $[C_2H_4]/[O_3]$ was found to be near unity at low ethylene concentrations and to increase to a limiting value of about 1.6 as the olefin pressure was increased. Bufalini and Altshuller reported the experimental Arrhenius frequency factor and activation energy to be 1.7×10^6 $\underline{M}^{-1}$ sec^{-1} and 4.2 ± 0.4 kcal/mole, respectively. At 25°C, the latter parameters correspond to a rate constant of 1.6×10^3 $\underline{M}^{-1}$ sec^{-1}.

Similar Arrhenius parameters were reported by DeMore (80) although his reaction temperatures were in the range from -40° to -95°C. The rates in this temperature range were still independent of the presence of oxygen, and the consumption ratio $[C_2H_4]/[O_3]$ was 1.0 ± 0.3 in the absence of O_2 and 1.2 ± 0.3 with O_2. DeMore also observed aerosol formation which was reduced by not using any diluent gas. However, infrared analysis apparently

provided no information concerning the nature of this aerosol or of any other reaction products.

More recently Stedman et al (82) and Herron and Huie (83) have examined the ozonolysis of ethylene at low reactant pressures. In the work of Stedman et al., the reactant concentrations were in the parts per million range and the total pressures were kept at one atmosphere. Only a single temperature of 26 ± 2°C was used in this work, and the second-order rate constant was found to be 0.93×10^{7} $\underline{M}^{-1}$ sec^{-1} in either O_2 or N_2 diluent. Herron and Huie followed the reaction by mass spectroscopy in the temperature range of -40 to 90°C. Ethylene pressures were below one Torr but kept about ten times greater than the ozone pressures. These authors observed with argon carrier gas that nonreproducible results were obtained and the apparent second-order rate constants were much greater than those obtained with O_2 buffer gas. With oxygen at about 5 Torr, the resulting second-order rate constants and their Arrhenius parameters were in close agreement with values obtained by other investigators.

The difference in rate coefficient and mechanism in the presence of O_2 found by Herron and Huie (83) and Finlayson et al (73) confirmed the earlier report of Wei and Cvetanović (78) who found that the ratio of olefin to ozone consumed is unity in the absence of O_2 but between 1.4 and 2.0 in its presence. Furthermore the relative rate coefficient (compared to the i-C_4H_8-O_3 reaction) was different in the O_2 and N_2 buffered systems (78).

Herron and Huie (83) also studied the ozonolysis of propylene and found that its apparent second-order rate constant decreased by a factor of almost two as the O_2 pressure was increased to about one Torr. At higher O_2 buffer gas pressures, the second-order rate constants remained constant and at a value of 6.36×10^{7} $\underline{M}^{-1}$ sec^{-1} (25°C) which agreed with those reported by earlier workers.

Summary of the kinetic data for the ozonolysis of ethylene is presented in Table IX. Experimental results obtained by Cvetanović and coworkers (76-78) are not included here since only relative rates of ethylene with respect to other olefins were obtained. However, on the basis of analysis by gas-liquid chromatography, Vrbaski and Cvetanović (77) found that one mole each of C_2H_4 and O_3 gave 0.25 mole of HCOOH, 0.019 mole of CH_3CHO, and small amounts of other unknown products.

The only attempt of a quantitative kinetic study of the ethylene-ozone reaction in the liquid phase was that by Williamson and Cvetanović (84). Carbon tetrachloride solution was used by these investigators, but due to loss of olefin from the solution the kinetic results were inconclusive. However, by assuming that the relative rates with respect to 1-hexene were the same in the vapor and CCl_4 solution, Williamson and Cvetanović (69) estimated the second-order rate constant for the ethylene-ozone reaction in CCl_4 solution at 25°C to be about 2.4×10^5 $\underline{M}^{-1}$ sec^{-1}.

Other liquid phase studies reported in the literature appear to deal primarily with product identification for mechanistic purposes. Inert solvents and reduced temperatures have been used in these studies in order to minimize the decomposition of the reaction intermediates or products. Under these experimental conditions, some higher molecular weight peroxides are obtained but the major reaction product is the 1,2,4-trioxacyclopentane (commonly called secondary ethylene ozonide or simply ethylene ozonide). The infrared spectra of ethylene ozonide in the vapor phase at 30°C and in the solid phase at liquid nitrogen temperature are shown in Figure 4. Our vapor phase spectrum is essentially the same as that reported first by Garvin and Schubert (90). Band frequencies and their tentative assignments are given in Table X. The complete microwave structure of ethylene ozonide

Table IX

Kinetics of ethylene-ozone reaction in the presence of excess O_2

Investigators	Species Followed[a]	Temperature (°C)	Reactants (Torr)	$[C_2H_4]/[O_3]$ Consumption	Arrhenius Parameters E(kcal/mole)	Arrhenius Parameters A($M^{-1}sec^{-1}$)	k at 25°C (M^{-1} sec^{-1})
Cadle and Schadt (74)	O_3(IR)	30 to 50	0.1 to 3	2 to 3	0	2.1×10^3	2.1×10^3
Bufalini and Altshuler (79)	O_3(KI) C_2H_4(GC)	30 to 100	ppm range	1 to 1.6	4.2 ± 0.4	1.7×10^6	1.6×10^3
DeMore (80)	O_3(UV)	-95 to -40	2 to 20	1.0 ± 0.3 1.2 ± 0.3(O_2)	4.7 ± 0.2	2.0×10^6	0.79×10^3
Stedman et al (82)	O_3(NO) C_2H_4(GC)	26	ppm range	-	-	-	0.93×10^3
Herron and Huie (83)	O_3(MS)	-40 to 90	ppm to 1	-	5.1 ± 0.3	5.4×10^6	1.02×10^3
Finlayson et al (73)	O_3(UV)	25	~0.5×10^{-3}(O_3) ~4×10^{-3}(C_2H_4)	-	-	-	1.0×10^3

a) IR = by infrared spectroscopy, KI = by KI titration, GC = by gas chromatography, UV = by ultraviolet spectroscopy, NO = by nitric oxide chemiluminescence, MS = by mass spectroscopy.



Figure 4: Infrared spectra of primary and secondary ethylene ozonides at liquid nitrogen temperature. In part from Hull et al (88).

Table X

Infrared spectra of primary and secondary ethylene ozonide[a]

Secondary Ozonide		Primary Ozonide[b]	Tentative
Vapor (30°C)	Solid (-190°C)	Solid (-190°C)	Assignment
2996 w	3050 w	-	CH_2 stretch
2974 s	2980 m	-	CH_2 stretch
2900 s	2910 s	-	CH_2 stretch
	2894 m	-	CH_2 stretch
	1646 w	-	combination
	∿1480 w	-	CH_2 deformation
∿1380 w	1395 vw	-	CH_2 deformation
		1390 w	CH_2 deformation
∿1350 w	1350 m		CH_2 twist
		1325 w	CH_2 twist
1260 w			difference band
		1214 w	CC stretch
∿1207 w	1212 m	-	CO stretch
1133 m	1130 m	-	CH_2 wag
		1125 w	CH_2 wag
1082 vs	1060 vs	-	CO stretch
∿1038 m	1020 s	-	CO stretch
		983 m	OO stretch
957 vs	932 vs	-	CO stretch
		927 m	CO stretch
∿933 m	917 m	-	OO stretch
		843 w	OO stretch
798 m	804 s	-	ring bend
	733 w	-	ring bend
		730 m	ring bend
698 w	696 m	-	CH_2 rock
		687 w	CH_2 rock
		650 m	ring bend
		410 w	ring bend
∿400 w	405 w	-	ring bend

a) Frequencies are in cm^{-1} unit.
b) A dash indicates overlap with the secondary ozonide.

...has been determined by Gillies and Kuczkowski (85, 86). The molecule has a half-chair conformation (Cs point group) with the geometry as shown in Figure 5, but no evidence of free or hindered ring pseudo-rotation was found. This ozonide also has a dipole moment of 1.99 debye, and on the basis of temperature dependence of its microwave line intensities a low frequency fundamental at [illegible] was presumed by Gillies and Kuczkowski as a possible ring puckering vibrational mode. These investigators also carried out the low temperature liquid phase ozonolysis reaction in the presence of formaldehyde-^{18}O and showed that the oxygen isotope appears exclusively in the ether position of the ozonide (85-87). In addition, when ethylene-d_4 was used in the reaction, ethylene ozonide-d_4 and two d_2-species, all in about equal amounts, and smaller quantities of three types of d_3-species were identified by microwave spectroscopy. Above room temperature, gaseous ethylene ozonide decomposes slowly by a first-order process giving quantitatively formaldehyde and formic acid as products (89). The first-order rate constant has been determined in the temperature range of 46° to 83°C as $k = 10^{13.5} \exp(-27.5 \text{ kcal/mole/RT})$ (89).

The reaction of ethylene with ozone in the solid phase has been studied by Hall et al. (88), with infrared spectroscopy. As the reactants were warmed from liquid nitrogen temperature to about -170°C, a new set of diffuse absorption bands appeared indicating the formation of one major primary product. On further warming to temperatures near -100°C, this primary product decayed into the known secondary ethylene ozonide. Vaporization of the reaction mixture and its spectroscopic analysis showed that the secondary ethylene ozonide was the final major product with formaldehyde and formic acid being minor products. Also, small amounts of polymeric material remained on the low temperature infrared window. From the



Figure 5: Microwave structure of secondary ethylene ozonide. From data of Gillies and Kuczkowski (85, 86).

frequencies of the absorption bands of the primary product and from the fact that similar sets of bands were displayed by the initial products in reactions of other olefins with ozone, the primary species of the ethylene-ozone solid phase reaction at low temperatures was identified as the 1,2,3-trioxacyclopentane (primary ethylene ozonide). The infrared spectrum of a solid sample containing both the primary and the secondary ethylene ozonide is shown in Figure 6. Frequencies of the primary ozonide bands are listed in Table X. The most characteristic band in the spectrum of this ozonide at liquid nitrogen temperature is the intense sharp band at 983 cm^{-1} which does not overlap with bands of other species present in the reaction mixture.

[illegible] Heicklen (68) and later confirmed by [illegible] Gozzo and Camaggi (91), only carbonyl fluoride and oxygen are observed as products of the vapor phase ozonolysis of tetrafluoroethylene at room temperature. Two moles of carbonyl fluoride were obtained from each mole of olefin, so the reaction stoichiometry is evidently

$$C_2F_4 + 2O_3 \rightarrow 2CF_2O + 2O_2 \qquad 56$$

The kinetics of reaction 56 at 25°C was studied by Heicklen for ozone and olefin pressures in the range of 0.1 to 10 Torr and 0.2 to 6 Torr, respectively. Initial rates, $R_i(CF_2O)$, were determined by following the infrared carbonyl fluoride band at 965 cm^{-1}. At constant C_2F_4 pressure, $R_i(CF_2O)$ increased linearly with increasing ozone pressure but became independent or even decreased at higher pressures of ozone. The experimental data although limited were interpreted on the basis of the rate equation

$$R_i(CF_2O) = \frac{k\,k'[O_3][C_2F_4]^2}{1 + k'[C_2F_4]} \qquad \text{XIII}$$

for which Heicklen obtained at 25°C, $k = 300\ \underline{M}^{-1}\ sec^{-1}$ and $k' = 9 \times 10^3\ \underline{M}^{-1}$.

The investigation of Gozzo and Camaggi (91) was concerned primarily with the reaction stoichiometry and product identification. Their vapor phase work appeared to be limited to the confirmation of equation XIII and most

of their studies were conducted with solutions of inert halocarbon solvents at 0°C. They employed a flow system with ozone in helium carrier gas and determined the reactant consumption and product formation in millimole/hour. When the olefin was in excess (reactant ratio $[C_2F_4]/[O_3] \sim 50$), the major products were carbonyl fluoride and tetrafluoroethylene epoxide. Traces of perfluorocyclopropane also appeared but the reaction stoichiometry was best represented by

$$2C_2F_4 + O_3 \rightarrow 2CF_2O + \overline{CF_2CF_2O} \qquad 56'$$

The product ratio $[CF_2O]/[\overline{CF_2CF_2O}]$ varied approximately as $2 + 8([O_3]/[C_2F_4])$. For reactant ratio $[C_2F_4]/[O_3]$ near unity, small amounts of secondary ozonide of C_2F_4 were formed in addition to CF_2O, $\overline{CF_2CF_2O}$, and $c\text{-}C_3F_6$. In these cases the reaction stoichiometry was that given by reaction 56 but the oxygen balance was poor due to the formation of small quantities of polymer. The secondary ozonide of C_2F_4 was reported to be a liquid at room temperature and to react with aqueous KI to give a mole of iodine, two moles of carbon dioxide, and four moles of fluoride ion. Its infrared spectrum has two intense bands near 1300 cm^{-1} and 1200 cm^{-1}, and its mass spectrum has mass peaks corresponding to the ions $C_2F_4O_3^+$, $C_2F_4O_2^+$, and $C_2F_4O^+$.

C_2Cl_4: The kinetics of the reaction between O_3 and C_2Cl_4 at 25°C has been studied in the vapor phase by Mathias, et al. (5), and in CCl_4 solution by Williamson and Cvetanović (69). Although the latter investigators did not report the products of this reaction, in our laboratory (92) this reaction has been examined in the solid phase at liquid nitrogen temperature and in the liquid phase at reduced temperatures. In the solid phase, ozone did not react with C_2Cl_4 but formed a π-complex which has a weak characteristic infrared band at 1030 cm^{-1} and which decomposed reversibly into the reactants at about -130°C. Similar π-complexes have been observed

before in many alkene and ozone solid phase reactions (88). No ozonides were formed in the liquid phase either. Vaporization of the liquid phase products gave CCl_2O and CCl_3CClO as major products, $\overline{CCl_2CCl_2}O$ as a minor product, and traces of HCOOH and a high boiling polymer. The formation of the HCOOH was minimized by keeping our reaction vessel dry. The stoichiometry of the liquid phase reaction could not be determined because of poor oxygen mass balance. However, the olefin consumption appeared to be accounted for in the CCl_2O and CCl_3CClO yields, and more phosgene than acid chloride was always produced.

The products of the gas phase reaction at 25°C were essentially the same as those observed from the liquid phase study. However, traces of CO_2, CO, and Cl_2 were observed when the reaction was permitted to continue for long periods. Once again, it was not possible to determine the reaction stoichiometry but more products appeared to be formed when oxygen was used as the buffer gas. The reaction was clean, ozone loss occurred rapidly in the ozone decomposition, the acid chloride slowly decayed with time, and the strongest infrared band of the minor product epoxide was obscured by an olefin infrared band. Figure 6 shows the variation in composition of a typical gas phase reaction. The reaction was strongly inhibited by oxygen. The initial rates, $R_i(CCl_2O)$ or $R_i(CCl_3CClO)$, determined by infrared spectroscopy, increased with olefin pressures but were not affected much by nitrogen buffer gas or the initial ozone pressure (range of a factor of two). A log-log plot of initial rates against olefin pressures (range of a factor of five) gave a slope of 1.8, and the average value of $R_i\{CCl_2O\}/R_i\{CCl_3CClO\}$ was 1.3. With O_2 buffer, the initial rate was decreased by a factor of at least ten.

Williamson and Cvetanović (69) found that the reaction rate in CCl_4 solution at 25°C was first order in both $[O_3]$ and $[C_2Cl_4]$. The concentration



Figure 6: Time dependence of the composition of C_2Cl_4 ozonolysis reaction at 24°C: $[C_2Cl_4]_0$ = 6.9 Torr, $[O_3]_0$ = 4.1 Torr. From Mathias et al (5) with permission of the National Research Council of Canada.

of olefin which was always in excess was varied in the range of one to five millimole/liter, and the ozone ultraviolet band at 0.280 μm was used to follow the rate. Under these conditions the second-order rate constant was 1.0 M^{-1} sec^{-1}.

$CHClCCl_2$: Only Williamson and Cvetanović (69) studied this reaction. In CCl_4 solution at 25°C, the rate was reported to be first order in each reactant with the second-order rate constant being 3.6 M^{-1} sec^{-1}. The products of the reaction or their stoichiometries are not known.

CH_2CCl_2: The products of the vapor phase reaction at 25°C have been identified by Hull et al (70) to be CCl_2O, HCOOH, $CH_2ClCCl(O)$, CO, CO_2, O_2, HCl, and possibly water although it was never detected. The yield of phosgene was always either comparable to or greater than the yield of formic acid, and the sum of the phosgene and acid chloride yields was generally slightly less than the disappearance of the olefin. Presumably, the hydrolysis of the acid chloride led to the latter inequality. The consumption ratio [olefin]/[O_2] was approximately unity when the reactant pressures were comparable but this ratio approached two as the olefin was made more in excess. With O_2 buffer gas, the limiting consumption ratio was near five for high excess olefin runs. On the other hand, the yield of CCl_2O per mole of O_2 with N_2 buffer appeared to be independent of the relative amounts of the reactants and varied in the range of 0.3 to 0.4. The same mole ratio increased to near unity in oxygen buffer when the olefin was made more excess.

In CCl_4 solutions at 25°C, Williamson and Cvetanović (69) found that the yield of phosgene per reactant olefin consumed was essentially quantitative (GC analysis). However, the only other product observed was a white solid which remained after solvent evaporation and which exploded violently on attempt to collect the material. In the low temperature solid phase

reaction (92) on the other hand, both CCl_2O and $CH_2ClCCl(O)$ have been identified. Infrared analysis of the solid reactants showed initially the reversible formation of a π-complex, and on further warming to about -90°C only the infrared bands due to phosgene and acid chloride appeared. Vaporization of the reaction mixture showed unreacted olefin, CCl_2O, $CH_2ClCCl(O)$, and HCOOH.

When olefin was in excess, the rate of ozonolysis of CH_2CCl_2 at 25°C in CCl_4 solution was found to consume equal amounts of reactants, to be first order in each reactant, and to have a rate constant of 22 $l\ M^{-1}\ sec^{-1}$ (69). The kinetics is more complex in the vapor phase at the same temperature for Hull et al (70) determined the rate law to be

$$-d[O_3]/dt = -d[CH_2CCl_2]/dt = k_{XIV}[CH_2CCl_2][O_3]^2 \qquad XIV$$

with N_2 buffer gas, and

$$-d[O_3]/dt = k_{XV}[CH_2CCl_2][O_3] \qquad XV$$

when oxygen gas was used as buffer. In these studies the ozone pressure was a Torr or less and the olefin was varied from 3 to 100 Torr. The experimental values of the rate constants were $k_{XIV} = (2.4 \pm 0.6) \times 10^6$ $l^2\ M^{-2}\ sec^{-1}$ and $k_{XV} = 2.2 \pm 0.6\ l\ M^{-1}\ sec^{-1}$. With O_2 buffer, the second-order rate constant for equation XV obtained from the decay of an olefin infrared band or the combined rate of appearance of phosgene and acid chloride bands was almost a factor of two greater. Also, the value of 2.2 $l\ M^{-1}\ sec^{-1}$ was an average of k_{XV} values which appeared to decrease systematically by a factor of almost two as the olefin pressure was increased from 8 to 100 Torr. In addition, with both N_2 and O_2 buffers, the initial rates appeared to be somewhat faster than the rates predicted by the rate equations XIV and XV when the olefin pressures were low.

CHClCHCl (DCE): The stoichiometry of the gas phase reaction between cis or trans-DCE and ozone at 23°C has been established quantitatively by Blume et al (71) to be as given by reaction 57.

$$2CHClCHCl + 2O_3 \rightarrow 4HCClO + O_2 \qquad 57$$

The reactant pressures were measured directly, the oxygen concentrations were determined by gas chromatography after completion of the reaction, and the unstable formyl chloride (93) concentrations were established spectroscopically. Since the formyl chloride was known to decompose to HCl and CO with a half-life of about 10-20 minutes, the products of reaction 57 were allowed to stand until the formyl chloride infrared bands disappeared. From the infrared determination of the absolute concentration of CO and from the known reactant pressures and initial absorbance of HCClO, the absorption coefficients of the HCClO infrared bands were calculated. The two most intense bands of this molecule are the carbonyl stretch at 1784 cm^{-1} and the CCl stretch at 739 cm^{-1} (93). The decadic absorption coefficients of the R-branches of these bands were found to be 0.0194 and 0.0179 $Torr^{-1}$ cm^{-1}, respectively (71). In addition to HCClO, O_2, HCl, and CO, traces of CCl_2O and HCOOH were observed in some of the reaction mixtures. The latter two species evidently came from hydrolysis reactions for it was possible to minimize their formation by careful pumping of the reaction vessels.

The stoichiometry for the ozonolysis of cis-DCE in CCl_4 solution at 25°C was examined by Williamson and Cvetanović (69). They determined the consumption ratio $[DCE]/[O_3]$ to be one but were able to identify only one product from the gas chromatographic analysis. This product was phosgene and 0.18 mole of it was reported to be generated from each mole of DCE consumed. These investigators reported, however, that with 50% completion of the reaction three other GC-peaks appeared whose retention times were

shorter than that for CCl_2O and whose relative peak areas changed with time. In the study of the liquid phase (71) formed by allowing the solid reactants to melt at reduced temperatures, HCClO was observed as the major product with only traces of HCOOH and CCl_2O. Small amounts of explosive clear liquid also remained after evaporation of the liquid mixture. The decomposition of HCClO in the liquid phase was very much faster than the gas-phase rate but HCl and CO were still the products. The three unidentified GC-peaks observed by Williamson and Cvetanović may very well have been HCClO, HCl, and CO. The reaction in the low-temperature solid phase gave essentially the same products (92) as those observed in the liquid phase. Only a π-complex and no ozonides were observed as the solid reactants were allowed to warm slowly. At temperatures above about -150°C, absorption bands due to solid HCClO grew. Formyl chloride began to sublime off the low temperature window at about -110°C.

Relatively simple kinetics was observed by Williamson and Cvetanović (69) for the ozonolysis of DCE in CCl_4 solution at 25°C. The rate was first-order in each reactant with the second-order rate constant being 35.7 $\underline{M}^{-1}$ sec^{-1} for cis-DCE and 591 $\underline{M}^{-1}$ sec^{-1} for the trans-isomer. Thus, in CCl_4 solution at 25°C the reactivity toward ozone of trans-DCE is about seventeen times faster than that of the cis-DCE which in turn reacts about six times faster than does 1,1-DCE. The kinetics in the gas phase, on the other hand, was expected to be complex since reaction 57 under excess olefin condition caused the isomerization of the reactant in addition to giving the products formyl chloride and oxygen (93). Subsequent studies by Blume et al (71) have shown indeed that reaction 57 has an exceedingly complex kinetics.

Blume et al used infrared and ultraviolet spectroscopy to follow the rates of reaction 57. Olefin pressures ranged from 0.2 to 40 Torr for cis-DCE and from 0.3 to 80 Torr for trans-DCE. Ozone pressures were limited to below about 7 Torr. Rates were also determined with the reactants buffered

with N_2 and O_2 gas. It was found experimentally that the rates of reaction satisfied the condition $R = -d[DCE]/dt = -d[O_2]/dt = +d[HCClO]/2dt$ and could be expressed in the general form

$$R = k_{XVI}[DCE]^n[O_2]^m \qquad XVI$$

where n and m had values of one or two depending on the pressure range of each reactant. When the pressures of O_2 and DCE were both of the order of one Torr or less, it was found that $n = m = 2$. Figure 7 illustrates a kinetic plot of such a reaction in which [trans-DCE] = $[O_2]$ = 0.62 Torr so that $1/[O_2]$ plotted against reaction time gave a straight line. Also, when one of the other reactant was in excess, second-order kinetic plots were obtained by following the reactant not in excess. However, in excess some kinetic runs with $[O_2]$ greater than about 3 Torr, n = 2 was still satisfied but the fourth-order rate constant with m = 2 decreased as the O_2 pressures were increased. In these kinetic runs more constant rate coefficients were obtained by taking m = 1. Finally, when the olefin was in excess and [DCE] was greater than about 4 Torr, both exponents became unity as in Figure 8 shows a first-order plot of an excess cis-DCE reaction in which the formation of HCClO was followed. With N_2 buffer, the rates were noticeably faster at the beginning of the reaction as is apparent in Figure 8, but the rates soon followed first-order kinetics. Such initial effects were absent when O_2 buffer was used as illustrated in Figure 9. Moreover, the second-order rate constants obtained from the final first-order kinetic section of the N_2-buffered reactions were the same within experimental uncertainty limits as the second-order rate constants derived from the O_2 buffered reactions. Also, under all reactant pressure conditions, rate constants obtained from reactions with O_2 buffer were always less by as much as a factor of ten than the initial rate constants from the N_2-buffered reactions.



Figure 7: Fourth order kinetic plot of trans-CHClCHCl reaction with ozone at 23°C. From Blume et al (71).



Figure 8. First order kinetic plot of cis-CHClCHCl reaction with ozone at 23 C in N_2 buffer. From Blume et al (71).



Figure 9: First order kinetic plot of cis-CHClCHCl reaction with ozone at 23 C in O_2 buffer. From Blume et al (71).



Figure 9: First order kinetic plot of cis-CHClCHCl reaction with ozone at 23 C in O_2 buffer. From Blume et al (71).

Numerical values of the various experimental rate constants are summarized in Table XI. There were considerable uncertainties due to the limited pressure ranges in which the rates could be determined, but the trans-DCE definitely reacted faster than did the cis-isomer.

It was already pointed out that the reaction under excess olefin conditions led to some isomerization of the reactant olefin. Similar isomerizations were observed even in excess ozone runs provided the olefin pressures were reasonably high. Figure 10 illustrates the experimental results from such a case. Here, the pressure variations of the reactant cis-DCE and the products trans-DCE and HCClO were determined from three separate experiments in which the reactant pressures were comparable. It is evident from this figure that the isomerization reaction appears to be faster than the ozonolysis reaction. In excess cis-DCE with ozone pressures of about one Torr, the yield of trans-isomer appeared to increase from 20% to about 30% as the olefin pressure was increased from 6 to 40 Torr. On the other hand, with a similar pressure of ozone only 3-4 Torr of cis-isomer was formed from excess trans-DCE even though its pressures were varied from 6-20 Torr. Although it was not experimentally feasible to study the kinetics of isomerization of the olefin, the isomerization rates appeared to be a measure of the rates of ozone disappearance as illustrated in Figure 11. In this run, 1.72 Torr of trans-DCE and 4.58 Torr of cis-DCE were observed at the end of the reaction, so that 7.31 - 1.72 - 4.58 = 1.01 Torr of reactant olefin was consumed while the initial pressure of O_3 was 1.08 Torr.

$\underline{CHClCH_2}$: Vinyl chloride also was one of the chloroethylenes examined by Williamson and Cvetanović (69). They found that 1.2 mole of CH_2CHCl was consumed for each mole of ozone during the ozonolysis in CCl_4 solution at 25 C, but the only reaction product identified by gas chromatography was 0.06

Table XI

Kinetic data for the ozonolysis of 1,2-dichloroethylene (DCE)

Solvent and Temperature	Concentration	Rate Equation	Rate Constants[a]	Source
CCl_4 solution 25°C	$[O_3] \ll [DCE] = 1 \times 10^{-3} - 5 \times 10^{-3}$ M	$R\{O_3\} = k[DCE][O_3]$	cis 35.7 $M^{-1}sec^{-1}$ trans 591 $M^{-1}sec^{-1}$	Williamson and Cvetanović (69)
$N_2(O_2)$ gas 23°C	$[DCE] \cong [O_3]$ <1 Torr	$R\{DCE\} = R\{O_3\} = k[DCE]^2[O_3]^2$	cis $1.23 \times 10^{11} M^{-3}sec^{-1}$ ($0.12 \times 10^{11} M^{-3}sec^{-1}$)	Blume et al (71)
			trans $13.1 \times 10^{11} M^{-3}sec^{-1}$ ($4.0 \times 10^{11} M^{-3}sec^{-1}$)	
	$[DCE] \leq 1$ Torr $[O_3] \gtrsim 2$ Torr	$R\{DCE\} = k[DCE]^2[O_3]$	cis $2.4 \times 10^{7} M^{-2}sec^{-1}$ ($0.146 \times 10^{7} M^{-2}sec^{-1}$)	
			trans $3.2 \times 10^{7} M^{-2}sec^{-1}$ ($0.59 \times 10^{7} M^{-2}sec^{-1}$)	
	$[DCE] > 3$ Torr $\gg [O_3]$	$R\{O_3\} = k[DCE][O_3]$	cis $4.6 \times 10^{2} M^{-1}sec^{-1}$ ($0.37 \times 10^{2} M^{-1}sec^{-1}$)	
			trans $9.0 \times 10^{2} M^{-1}sec^{-1}$ ($2.3 \times 10^{2} M^{-1}sec^{-1}$)	

a) Rate constants enclosed in parentheses are from O_2 buffered reactions.



Figure 10: Ozone catalyzed isomerization of cis-CHClCHCl at 23°C. From Blume et al (71).



Figure 11: First order kinetic plot from the isomerization data for the cis-CHClCHCl reaction at 23°C with O_2 buffer. From Blume et al (71).

mole of phosgene per mole of olefin consumed. The reaction rate was observed to be first order in each reactant and to have a second-order rate constant of 1.18×10^3 $\underline{M}^{-1}$ sec^{-1}.

In the infrared spectroscopic study of vinyl chloride ozonolysis, currently in progress in our laboratory, Kolopajlo (94) observed no CCl_2O among the products. Instead the primary products from both the gas and liquid phase reactions were formic acid and formyl chloride. Furthermore, the reaction stoichiometry appeared to be represented by

$$CH_2CHCl + O_3 \rightarrow HCOOH + HCClO \qquad 58$$

The reaction in the solid phase at low temperatures gave more informative results (92). The 1030 cm^{-1} region where the olefin-ozone π-complexes absorb (88) was obscured by the infrared bands of the reaction products and by an olefin band, so the presence of a π-complex in this case could not be verified. However, as the solid reactants were warmed to about -165°C, two sets of new absorption bands started to appear. Repeated warming of the solid sample to about -150°C caused the bands of both sets to grow at the same rate. One set of bands was readily identified as belonging to formyl chloride (93), and this compound began to sublime off the low temperature infrared window at about -120°C. The second set of bands which is illustrated in Figure 12 has been assigned to the primary ozonide of vinyl chloride. This ozonide was found to be stable to about -55°C, above which it decomposed irreversibly into formic acid, formyl chloride, and a somewhat volatile polymer. Interestingly, the infrared spectrum of the latter polymer was essentially the same as that of the peroxidic polymer observed in the decomposition of ethylene primary ozonide (88).

The spectrum shown in Figure 12 has a strong resemblance to those of primary and secondary ethylene ozonides illustrated in Figure 4. Bands near



Figure 12: Infrared spectrum of vinyl chloride primary ozonide at liquid nitrogen temperature. The absorption bands identified by arrows are assigned to the more stable isomer of the ozonide. The weak band at 1755 cm^{-1} is due to formyl chloride residue still in the ozonide sample. From Hisatsune et al (92).

1000 cm^{-1} are presumably due to O-O and C-O bond stretching modes, but there are two intense bands near 700 cm^{-1} where the C-Cl stretch band is expected. Although these bands grew at the same rate as the primary ozonide was being formed, during the decomposition their relative intensity ratios were no longer constant. Thus, these bands evidently represent the expected two isomers (95) of the vinyl chloride primary ozonide, but the assignment of each peak to the axial C-Cl or the equatorial C-Cl stretch in the puckered, five-membered tri-oxa ring is not apparent. Nevertheless, the ozonide with the lower C-Cl stretch frequency appeared to be the more stable isomer and other bands associated with this species are identified by arrows in Figure 12.

The kinetics of the ozonolysis of vinyl chloride in the gas phase is also under investigation in our laboratory (94). Preliminary studies have shown that this reaction appears to be too fast for spectroscopic study without oxygen buffer gas. With oxygen, however, the reaction is strongly inhibited and its rate can be followed conveniently by ordinary spectroscopic instruments. The results from one such kinetic run are displayed in Figure 13. Here the pressures of vinyl chloride and oxygen are similar, and a plot of the inverse of vinyl chloride pressure is essentially a linear function of time. Thus, the rate under these particular experimental conditions is first order in each reactant. The resulting second-order rate constant is 3.9 $\underline{M}^{-1}$ sec^{-1} at 22°C which is three orders of magnitude smaller than the rate constant for the same reaction in CCl_4 solution at 25°C in the absence of O_2.

Review of Ozonolysis Mechanisms

C_2H_4: The recent experimental data for the condensed phase reactions of ethylene and ozone are still consistent with the Criegee mechanism (96) of olefin ozonolysis, which can be represented by the following sequence of reactions



Figure 13: Second order kinetic plot of vinyl chloride reaction with ozone at 22°C. From Kolopajlo (94).

$$CH_2CH_2 + O_3 \rightarrow \overline{CH_2CH_2OOO} \quad 59$$

$$\overline{CH_2CH_2OOO} \rightarrow H_2C^+OO^- + CH_2O \quad 60$$

$$H_2C^+OO^- + CH_2O \rightarrow \overline{CH_2OCH_2OO} \quad 61$$

$$H_2C^+OO^- \rightarrow HCOOH \quad 62$$

The low temperature infrared studies of Hull et al (88) have shown that the first stable product formed by reaction 59 near liquid nitrogen temperature was the primary ozonide 1,2,3-trioxacyclopentane. Further warming of the solid sample to about -100°C caused the primary ozonide to change smoothly into the secondary ozonide which remained stable to room temperature. In the vapor phase at temperatures above about 50°C, the secondary ozonide was observed to decompose (89) by a first-order process to give formaldehyde and formic acid. The formation of the zwitterion in reaction 60 was inferred by the small amounts of polymeric peroxides observed after completion of each experiment. Minor amounts of HCOOH and CH_2O were also observed in the solid phase reaction. The HCOOH could come from reaction 62 or the formation of energetic secondary ozonide via reaction 61 followed by decomposition prior to stabilization. The simultaneous formation of both the primary and secondary ozonides during the initial warming sequence also indicated that reaction 59 must be exothermic. The enthalpy change for the corresponding reaction 59 with 1-butene has been estimated by O'Neal and Blumstein (97) to be about -47 kcal/mole. Kuczkowski and coworkers (85-87) have provided a convincing demonstration of reactions 60 and 61 in the liquid phase ozonolysis by showing that the isotopic oxygen atom from the reactant CH_2O entered exclusively the epoxy position in the secondary ozonide, and that no labelled oxygen entered the peroxy position as previously reported (98, 99). Thus, it appears unnecessary in the present sequence of reactions to invoke, as Story and coworkers (100, 101) have proposed in other ozonolysis

studies, the Staudinger primary ozonide (102) as a precursor to the



1,2,3-trioxacyclopentane, or the following additional reaction paths (103) for the formation of the secondary ozonide.



63



64

The low temperature spectroscopic studies of Hull et al (88), appear to clarify one other aspect of reaction 59, and this concerns the precursor, if any, to the primary ozonide. Vrbaski and Cvetanović (76) apparently were the first to propose for the ozonolysis of an aliphatic double bond that a π-complex may be formed in equilibrium with the reactants according to reaction 65 and that the subsequent rearrangement of this complex by reaction 66 was the source of the primary ozonide.

$$CH_2CH_2 + O_3 \rightleftarrows CH_2CH_2 \cdot O_3(\pi) \qquad 65$$

$$CH_2CH_2 \cdot O_3(\pi) \rightarrow \overbrace{CH_2CH_2OOO} \qquad 66$$

Story et al (103) have also included type 65 and 66 reactions in their ozonolysis mechanism but not as a reversible step 65. Bailey, et al (104) have described the 66 type reaction as a 1,3-dipolar cyclo-addition and have included additional decay steps for the π-complex to account for the expoxides and free radical products observed in many ozonolysis reactions. These additional steps in the present case would be as follows.

$$CH_2CH_2 \cdot O_3(\pi) \rightarrow CH_2CH_2 \cdot O_3(\sigma) \rightarrow \text{epoxides} \qquad 67$$

$$CH_2CH_2{\cdot}O_3(\pi) \rightleftharpoons CH_2CH_2O_3 \text{ (free radical zwitterion)} \quad 68$$

$$\Big|_{\cdot} \text{ radical chain carrier}$$

Carles and Fliszár (105), on the other hand, proposed two parallel paths to the primary ozonide formation, namely, the direct path reaction 59 and the sequential reactions 65 and 66 in which the complex could be either a π- or a σ-complex.

A common feature in all these proposed mechanisms is that the precursor of the primary ozonide is the π-complex. Although such a π-complex was not observed in the case of ethylene, the low temperature studies (88) revealed their presence in all other olefin and ozone reaction systems and in toluene-ozone systems as well. It appears very probable that the negative results with ethylene were not due to the real absence of such a complex but to the temperature limitation in the low-temperature cell used in the experiments. Thus, on the basis of the results from other olefins, one may conclude that reaction 65 is correct and that the complex must be a charge-transfer type π-complex. However, in no instance were the π-complexes of other simple olefins observed to give the primary ozonides. Instead, they decomposed reversibly to the original olefin and ozone. Hence, reaction 66 did not appear to occur in the condensed phases and the formation of the primary ozonide was by the direct reaction 59. Also, the products observed in these condensed phase reactions indicated that reactions 67 and 68 were not important. In summary, the ozonolysis of ethylene in the liquid and solid phases can be described adequately by the mechanism consisting of reactions 59 through 62 and reaction 65.

The mechanism for the gas phase ozonolysis of ethylene, on the other hand, still remains unclear primarily because of insufficient data and because of the experimental difficulties in getting such data. For example,

information on even the reaction products is not adequate, and species which have been identified experimentally appear to be limited to HCOOH (77), CH_3CHO (77), aerosol of unknown composition (80), and, under low-pressure chemiluminescent conditions (73), vibrationally excited OH and electronically excited CH_2O and OH. However, more data on product analysis are available for olefins of higher molecular weights, and on the basis of such results two mechanisms have been proposed. One mechanism, which is still essentially the Criegee mechanism, suggests that reactions 59 and 60 occur rapidly and subsequent reactions initiated particularly by CH_2OO lead to the observed products. Here, the species CH_2OO may react as a zwitterion (76, 106) or as a diradical (73). For example, the diradical may add to the ethylene and by a single or multiple steps lead to CH_2O and the observed rearrangement product CH_3CHO. The zwitterion may rearrange into HCOOH or react with oxygen (106) to produce hydroxyl and performate free radicals, both of which can initiate other free radical reactions.

The second mechanism is that due to O'Neal and Blumstein (97), and it was proposed principally to account for the energy requirements in chemiluminescent reactions and for the products such as α-diketones which are difficult to explain by the Criegee mechanism. These authors suggested that the primary ozonide formed in reaction 57 is in equilibrium with an opened-ring diradical species which for ethylene would be as follows

$$\overline{CH_2CH_2OOO} \rightleftarrows \cdot OCH_2CH_2OO \cdot \qquad 69$$

The diradical may then dissociate to give the normal Criegee products of reaction 60 or it may undergo an intramolecular α-hydrogen abstraction reaction to give an α-keto hydroperoxide.

$$\cdot OCH_2CH_2OO \cdot \rightarrow CH_2OO + CH_2O \qquad 70a$$

$$\rightarrow OCHCH_2OOH \qquad 70b$$

The hydroperoxide may decompose into the normal ozonolysis products, HCOOH and CH_2O, into water and glyoxal (α-diketone), or produce an OH radical and an oxy-free radical. O'Neal and Blumstein also estimated the energetics of reactions 70a and 70b and concluded that for ethylene and propylene the diradical should decay mainly by step 70a while for 1-butene and other olefins with greater internal degrees of freedom reaction 70b should dominate. Consequently, secondary ozonides should not be the major products from the latter ozonolysis reactions particularly at higher total pressures. The low temperature infrared studies (88), on the other hand, revealed that not only ethylene and propylene but 2-butenes also gave secondary ozonides. Although O'Neal and Blumstein suggested that reaction 63 may be the source of any unexpected secondary ozonides, the isotopic studies by Kuczkowski and coworkers (85-87) appear to rule out this possibility. It seems that the estimates of energetics of these ozonolysis reactions may not be completely valid or additional modifications of the reaction mechanism may be necessary.

A further shortcoming of the O'Neal-Blumstein mechanism is that internal β-hydrogen abstraction by the diradical was suggested to explain the chemiluminescence of O_3-olefin reactions. Of course in the C_2H_4 system there is no β-hydrogen. Finlayson et al (73) modified the O'Neal-Blumstein mechanism to suggest that electronically excited CH_2O was produced by α-hydrogen abstraction



$$\rightarrow HCOOH + CH_2O^* \qquad 71$$

but this route seems unlikely from both energetic and steric considerations. The experimental evidence clearly requires the presence of free H atoms, and Finlayson et al (73) suggested two routes both of which are variations of

sequential H atom splitting from the zwitterion

$$H_2COO \rightarrow HCOOH^* \rightarrow H + HCOO \rightarrow H + CO_2 \qquad 72$$

Again, these routes seem unlikely to us, and we prefer hydrogen abstraction by the single O atom in the diradical



$$\rightarrow H_2COH + HCOO \rightarrow H + CO_2 \qquad 73$$

The proposed routes for electronically excited OH production were (73)

$$O + H \rightarrow OH^*$$

$$O + HCO^* \rightarrow OH^* + CO$$

However, at this time the proposed routes to chemiluminescence must all be considered to be speculative.

Until very recently (83, 73) the only investigation that indicated that the second order kinetics of the gas phase ethylene ozonolysis was different in the absence and presence of O_2 was by Wei and Cvetanović (78). Herron and Huie (83) noted instead that the experimental results were nonreproducible and much larger second order rate constants were obtained when the reaction was carried out in argon buffer gas. However, with added O_2, rate constants which agreed with earlier literature values (in the presence of O_2) were obtained. In the case of propylene, Herron and Huie showed that the second order rate constant decreased by a factor of almost two as the O_2 pressure was increased to about one Torr and thereafter remained constant on further increase in O_2. This limiting rate constant was found to agree closely with those reported by earlier investigators (See Table IX). On the basis of these results and those reported by other investigators, Herron and Huie proposed a schematic free radical mechanism for the ozonolysis reaction.

$$O_3 + C_2H_4 \rightarrow P^* \qquad 74$$

$$P^* \rightarrow Q + R + \ldots \qquad 75$$

$$P^* + M \rightarrow P + M \qquad 76$$

$$O_3 + (Q + R + \ldots) \rightarrow \text{products} \qquad 77$$

$$O_2 + (Q + R + \ldots) \rightarrow \text{products} \qquad 78$$

Here, P^* was reported to be an adduct which is not necessarily formed initially but could be formed by a subsequent rearrangement.

$\underline{C_2F_4}$: A simple mechanism involving an ozone-olefin adduct was proposed by Heicklen (1, 68) to account for the limited experimental data available for this ozonolysis reaction.

$$C_2F_4 + O_3 \rightleftharpoons C_2F_4O_3 \qquad 79$$

$$C_2F_4O_3 + C_2F_4 \xrightarrow{O_3} 4CF_2O + O_2 \qquad 80$$

The nature of the initial adduct in reaction 79 was not specified but reaction 80 was proposed originally (68) to be composite and to involve intermediates such as CF_2, $(CF_2O)_2$, and C_2F_4O. Later (1), reaction 80 was represented by the following sequence of steps.

$$C_2F_4O_3 + C_2F_4 \rightarrow C_2F_4O + C_2F_4O_2 \qquad 81$$

$$C_2F_4O_2 \rightarrow 2CF_2O \qquad 82$$

$$C_2F_4O + O_3 \rightarrow C_2F_4O_2 + O_2 \qquad 83$$

Whichever multiple steps reaction 80 may involve, the rate equation resulting from reactions 79 and 80 is

$$R\{CF_2O\} = \frac{4k_{79}k_{80}[O_3][C_2F_4]^2}{k_{-79} + k_{80}[C_2F_4]} \qquad \text{XVII}$$

Comparison with the experimental rate equation gave $k_{79} = 300\ \underline{M}^{-1}\ sec^{-1}$, $k_{80}/k_{-79} > 9 \times 10^4\ \underline{M}^{-1}$ and $k_{79}k_{80}/k_{-79} > 3 \times 10^7\ \underline{M}^{-2}\ sec^{-1}$ at 25°C. However, this rate equation did not account for the observation that the rate became independent of $[O_3]$ or actually decreased at high ozone pressures.

Gozzo and Camaggi (91) included additional steps to the Criegee mechanism to explain the observed solution phase reaction products: CF_2O,

the epoxide $\overline{CF_2CF_2O}$, cyclo-C_3F_6, and traces of secondary ozonide.

$$C_2F_4 + O_3 \rightarrow [C_2F_4O_3] \rightarrow CF_2O + CF_2OO \quad 84$$

$$CF_2OO + C_2F_4 \rightarrow \overline{CF_2CF_2O} + CF_2O \quad 85$$

$$2CF_2OO \rightarrow 2CF_2O + O_2 \quad 86$$

$$CF_2OO \rightarrow CF_2 + O_2 \quad 87$$

$$CF_2 + C_2F_4 \rightarrow c\text{-}C_3F_6 \quad 88$$

However, these investigators also observed only CF_2O in the gas phase reaction, so the gas phase mechanism evidently consists of just reactions 84 and 86. Hence, the rate $R[CF_2O]$ will be first order in each reactant, a result in accord with Heicklen's (1, 68) high pressure limit. The reaction in the solution phase gave CF_2O and $\overline{CF_2CF_2O}$ as the major products, so in this case Gozzo and Camaggi considered only steps 84, 85, and 86. A steady-state approximation for CF_2OO gives

$$\frac{d[CF_2O]}{d[\overline{CF_2CF_2O}]} = 2 + \frac{2k_{84}k_{86}[O_2]}{k_{85}^2[C_2F_4]} \qquad \text{XVIII}$$

with $k_{84}k_{86}/k_{85}^2$ being about 4.

C_2Cl_4: On the basis of kinetic data from all the chloroethylenes studied in CCl_4 solutions, Williamson and Cvetanović (69) proposed the following general mechanism for the ozonolysis of these olefins RR'.

$$RR' + O_3 \rightarrow \text{product I} \quad 89$$

$$RR' + O_3 \rightleftharpoons RR'{\cdot}O_3 \quad 90$$

$$RR'{\cdot}O_3 \rightarrow \text{product II} \quad 91$$

Here, reaction 89 was described as a one-step process giving product I which does not return to the reactants. The complex formed in reaction 90 may return to the reactants with no geometric isomerization or it may decompose irreversibly according to reaction 91. In these reactions the products I and II are some intermediates of the reaction and not necessarily the final products. With this mechanism, the observed second order rate constant was

related to the elementary constants as follows:

$$k_{exp} = k_{99} + (k_{90}k_{91}/k_{-90})/(1 + k_{90}/k_{-90}) \qquad \text{XIX}$$

Although the experimental data were too limited to determine the relative importance of the one and two-step terms in equation XIX, Williamson and Cvetanović suggested the possibility that reaction 89 may lead to the primary ozonide while reactions 90 and 91 may correspond to the oxygen transfer process observed, for examle, in the ozonolysis of ethylene where CH_3CHO was produced. We have already quoted the second order rate constants obtained by Williamson and Cvetanović during the review of each haloethylene, but these constants are summarized together in Table XII.

A more elaborate mechanism was necessary to interpret the gas phase results obtained by Mathias et al (5). The initial step in this mechanism, shown below, gave the diradical Criegee product CCl_2OO which propagated a chain reaction.

$$C_2Cl_4 + O_3 \rightarrow CCl_2O + CCl_2OO \qquad 92$$

$$CCl_2OO + O_3 \rightarrow CCl_2O + 2O_2 \qquad 93$$

$$CCl_2OO + C_2Cl_4 \rightarrow CCl_2OO_2 \cdot C_2Cl_4 \qquad 94$$

$$CCl_2OO \cdot C_2Cl_4 + O_3 \rightarrow CCl_2OO \cdot C_2Cl_4 \cdot O_3 \qquad 95a$$

$$\rightarrow CCl_2OO + C_2Cl_4O + O_2 \qquad 95b$$

$$CCl_2OO \cdot C_2Cl_4 \cdot O_3 + C_2Cl_4 \rightarrow CCl_2OO + 2CCl_2O + C_2Cl_4O \qquad 96$$

In this mechanism, C_2Cl_4O formed in steps 95b and 96 represented both the epoxide $\overline{CCl_2CCl_2O}$ and the rearranged product $CCl_3CCl(O)$. Application of steady state approximations to the intermediates leads to the following initial rates, $R_i\{x\}$

$$R_i\{CCl_2O\} = 2k_{92}[O_3][C_2Cl_4] + 2\left(\frac{k_{92}k_{94}k_{95a}}{k_{93}k_{95}}\right)[C_2Cl_4]^2 \qquad \text{XX}$$

$$R_i\{C_2Cl_4O\} = \frac{k_{92}k_{94}}{k_{93}}[C_2Cl_4]^2 \qquad \text{XXI}$$

Table XII

Second order rate constants for the reactions of ozone with haloethylenes in CCl_4 solution at 25°C[a]

Haloethylenes	k_{exp} ($M^{-1}sec^{-1}$)
CCl_2CCl_2	1.0
$CHClCCl_2$	3.6
CH_2CCl_2	22.1
cis-CHClCHCl	35.7
trans-CHClCHCl	591
CH_2CHCl	1,180

a) From Williamson and Cvetanović (69).

For long chains, only the second term in equation XX is important so that the $R_i\{CCl_2O\}$ should be second order in $[C_2Cl_4]$ and independent of $[O_3]$. Experimentally, the olefin order was about 1.8 and no O_3 dependence was found. Also for long chains, $R_i\{CCl_2O\}/R_i\{C_2Cl_4O\} = 2k_{95a}/k_{95} = 1.3$ so the branching ratio $k_{95b}/k_{95a} = 0.54$.

The ozonolysis reaction was inhibited by O_2, and in this case the chain termination step was suggested to be as follows:

$$CCl_2OO\cdot C_2Cl_4 + O_2 \rightarrow CCl_2OO\cdot C_2Cl_4\cdot O_2 \qquad 97$$

$$CCl_2OO\cdot C_2Cl_4\cdot O_2 + C_2Cl_4 \rightarrow 3CCl_2O + C_2Cl_4O \qquad 98$$

The rate law for high pressures of oxygen then becomes

$$R_i\{CCl_2O\} = 4k_{92}[O_3][C_2Cl_4] \qquad XXII$$

where the upper limit of k_{92} was estimated to be 1.2×10^{-2} $\underline{M}^{-1}$ sec^{-1}. This second order rate constant is two orders of magnitude smaller than that obtained by Williamson and Cvetanović for reaction 92 in CCl_4 solution. Since the average value of $k_{92}k_{94}/k_{95}$ from the nitrogen buffered gas-phase reaction was 0.13 $\underline{M}^{-1}$ sec^{-1}, the lower limit of the ratio k_{94}/k_{93} becomes about 10.

<u>CH_2CCl_2</u>: The experimental data for the gas phase ozonolysis of CH_2CCl_2 were more extensive, and Hull et al (70) proposed the following chain mechanism:

$$CH_2CCl_2 + O_3 \rightarrow CH_2O + CCl_2OO \qquad 99a$$

$$\rightarrow CH_2OO + CCl_2O \qquad 99b$$

$$CCl_2OO + O_3 \rightarrow CCl_2O + 2O_2 \qquad 93$$

$$CCl_2OO + CH_2CCl_2 \rightarrow CCl_2OO\cdot CH_2CCl_2 \qquad 100$$

$$CCl_2OO\cdot CH_2CCl_2 + O_3 \rightarrow CCl_2OO\cdot CH_2CCl_2\cdot O_3 \qquad 101a$$

$$\rightarrow CCl_2OO + CCl_2O + HCOOH \qquad 101b$$

$$CCl_2OO\cdot CH_2CCl_2 + O_2 \rightarrow CCl_2OO\cdot CH_2CCl_2\cdot O_2 \qquad 102a$$

$$\rightarrow 2CCl_2O + HCOOH \qquad 102b$$

$$CCl_2OO{\cdot}CH_2CCl_2 \rightarrow CCl_2O + CH_2CCl_2O \qquad 103$$

$$CH_2O + O_3 \rightarrow O_2 + HCOOH \text{ (or } CO + H_2O) \qquad 104$$

$$CCl_2OO{\cdot}CH_2CCl_2{\cdot}O_3 + 2CH_2CCl_2 \rightarrow 3CH_2CCl_2O + CCl_2OO \qquad 105$$

$$CCl_2OO{\cdot}CH_2CCl_2{\cdot}O_2 + CH_2CCl_2 \rightarrow 2CH_2CCl_2O + CCl_2OO \qquad 106$$

The Criegee dissociation of the initial ozone-olefin adduct can occur in two ways, but on the basis of the reaction products, the stoichiometry, and the dependence of the rates on oxygen, Hull et al proposed that reaction 99a was the dominant primary step. Following this step, the propagation of the chain reaction is maintained by CCl_2OO through reactions 100, 101, 105, and 106. Reaction 104 was included to account for the absence of CH_2O among the products. The product CH_2CCl_2O in steps 103, 105, and 106 was considered to be vibrationally excited and to be the source of the rearranged acid chloride $CH_2ClCCl(O)$ and the products HCl and CO. In the absence of O_2 and for long chains, if $k_{103} \ll k_{101}[O_3]$ the above mechanism gives

$$-d[O_3]/dt = 2k_{99a}[CH_2CCl_2][O_3] + \frac{k_{99a}[CH_2CCl_2][O_3](k_{93}[O_3] + k_{100}[CH_2CCl_2])}{k_{93}[O_3] + k_{100}k_{103}[CH_2CCl_2]/k_{101}[O_3]} \qquad XXIII$$

At high CH_2CCl_2 but low O_3 pressures, equation XXIII reduces to

$$-d[O_3]/dt = (k_{99a}k_{101}/k_{103})[CH_2CCl_2][O_3]^2 \qquad XXIV$$

while at high O_3 but low CH_2CCl_2 pressures it becomes

$$-d[O_3]/dt = (k_{99a}k_{100}/k_{93})[CH_2CCl_2]^2 \qquad XXV$$

since under all the experimental conditions $k_{93}[O_3] \ll k_{100}[CH_2CCl_2]$. The latter rate equation was proposed as the reason for the faster rates observed initially in both N_2 and O_2 buffered reactions (See Figures 1 and 2 in Reference 70). For all pressure conditions, moreover, the mechanism gives:

$$d[CH_2CCl_2]/d[O_3] = 1 + 2k_{101a}/k_{101} \qquad \text{XXVI}$$

and

$$-d[CCl_2O]/d[O_3] = k_{101b}/k_{101} \qquad \text{XXVII}$$

When O_2 is present in excess and $(k_{101b}k_{100}/k_{102})[CH_2CCl_2] \gg k_{99}[O_3]$, the predicted rates are

$$d[CCl_2O]/dt = -d[O_3]/dt = 2k_{99a}[CH_2CCl_2][O_3] \qquad \text{XXVIII}$$

and the consumption ratio of the reactants becomes

$$d[CH_2CCl_2]/d[O_3] = 1 + k_{102a}/k_{102b} \qquad \text{XXIX}$$

Comparison of the derived rate equations and various ratios of the rates with those determined experimentally permitted Hull et al to evaluate the elementary rate constants given in Table XIII. In the study of Williamson and Cvetanović (69), the olefin concentrations, which were always in excess over the ozone concentration in the CCl_4 solutions, were equivalent to 2 to 92 Torr range, and thus similar to the pressure range used by Hull et al in N_2 buffered gas phase studies. Therefore, if the rate observed by Williamson and Cvetanović corresponds to that of reaction 99a, then this reaction is 20 times faster in CCl_4 solution than in the N_2 buffered gas phase.

CHClCHCl: The unusual changes in reaction order with pressure, the isomerization of the reactant, and the inhibition of the rate by O_2 suggested to Blume et al (71) that the mechanism of the ozonolysis of cis or trans-dichloroethylene (DCE) was a very complex chain reaction. The simplest mechanism which accounted for the observed results except the isomerization was proposed to be as follows:

$$R_2 + O_3 \rightleftarrows R_2O_3 \qquad 107$$

$$R_2O_3 + R_2 \rightleftarrows R_4O_3 \qquad 108$$

$$R_4O_3 + O_3 \rightarrow 2RO + 2RO_2 \qquad 109$$

$$RO_2 + R_2 \rightleftarrows R_3O_2 \qquad 110$$

Table XIII

Elementary rate constants in the mechanism of ozonolysis of 1,1-dichloroethylene at 25°C[a]

Rate Constant	Value	Units
$k_{99a}k_{101}/k_{103}$	2.4×10^6	$M^{-2}sec^{-1}$
k_{101a}/k_{101}	0.6	None
k_{101b}/k_{101}	0.4	None
$k_{99}k_{101}/k_{99}k_{103}$	$\sim 1.9 \times 10^5$	M^{-1}
k_{99a}	1.1	$M^{-1}sec^{-1}$
k_{102a}/k_{102b}	4	None
k_{101}/k_{103}	2.1×10^6	M^{-1}

a) From Hull et al (68).

$$R_3O_2 + O_3 \rightarrow R_3O_5 \xrightarrow{R_2,\ O_3} 4RO + RO_2 + O_2 \qquad 111a$$

$$\rightarrow 3RO + O_2 \qquad 111b$$

$$R_3O_2 + O_2 \rightarrow R_3O_4 \xrightarrow{O_3} 3RO + 2O_2 \qquad 112$$

Here, DCE is represented by R_2 and RO_2 (the Criegee diradical) is the chain carrier. Reactions 111b and 112 are the chain termination steps but whichever step is operating the overall stoichiometry becomes the same as that observed experimentally. Steady state approximations for the various reaction intermediates allow the derivation of the following rate equations.

$$R\{109\} = \frac{k_{107}k_{108}k_{109}[R_2]^2[O_3]^2}{k_{108}k_{109}[R_2][O_3] + k_{-107}(k_{-108} + k_{109}[O_3])} \qquad XXX$$

$$d[RO]/dt = 2R\{109\}\{1 + \frac{(4k_{111a} + 3k_{111b})[O_3] + 3k_{112}[O_2]}{k_{111b}[O_3] + k_{112}[O_2]}\} \qquad XXXI$$

The rate of disappearance of ozone $-R\{O_3\}$ or of the olefin $-R\{R_2\}$ is given by one-half the right-hand side of equation XXXI, and the expression enclosed in braces provides the O_2 dependence of the rate. With no O_2, this expression reduces to $\{4 + 4(k_{111a}/k_{111b})\}$ while with excess O_2 it becomes simply $\{4\}$. The $R\{109\}$ coefficient in equation XXXI, on the other hand, reduces to different expressions depending on the pressures of the reactants. For low R_2 and O_3 pressures

$$R\{109\} = \frac{k_{107}k_{108}k_{109}}{k_{-107}k_{-108}}[R_2]^2[O_3]^2 \qquad XXXII$$

so the reaction rate becomes fourth order overall. If $[R_2]$ is high, then

$$R\{109\} = k_{107}[R_2][O_3] \qquad XXXIII$$

Finally, when $[O_3]$ is high, the $R\{109\}$ term reduces to

$$R\{109\} = (k_{107}k_{108}/k_{-107})[R_2]^2[O_3] \qquad XXXIV$$

The three rate laws XXXII-XXXIV correspond to the three limiting cases observed experimentally.

By a computer fit of all the data, the pertinent ratios of rate coefficients for the mechanism consisting of reactions 107-112 were obtained, and they are summarized in Table XIV. If the second order rate constants determined from the CCl_4 solution by Williamson and Cvetanovic (69) were the same as k_{107}, then the gas phase constants for cis and trans-DCE are, respectively, about 0.62 and 0.25 of those in CCl_4 solution. In CCl_4 solution, the trans isomer reacted 17 times faster than did the cis-DCE while in the gas phase the trans isomer reacted only 6.7 times faster in the second order limit. In comparison to these differences, Carles and Fliszár (105) found that the ozonolysis of trans-2-pentene was just 1.5 times faster than the cis-isomer reaction in CCl_4 solution at 0°C.

The mechanism proposed here also provides possible channels for the isomerization of the DCE which was observed during the ozonolysis reaction. If the products of reactions 107, 108, and/or 109 are noncyclic with loss of carbon-carbon double bond character, then their decompositions to the reactants will give an isomer different from the initial reactants. Unfortunately, the ozonolysis rates of cis and trans-DCE were too similar in the gas phase and the experimental data were not sufficient to make any quantitative deductions concerning this isomerization reaction. However it appears that channels -107, -108, and -110 are not sufficient to explain the isomerization results, and other channels are needed.

Discussion

Although the available information, both experimental and mechanistic, on each haloethylene reviewed here is not sufficient to derive a complete general mechanism for the ozonolysis of simple olefins, two significant characteristics of such reactions emerge when the entire data are examined together. First, many of these ozonolysis reactions are inhibited by molecular oxygen. Such inhibitions have been observed in the ozonolysis of

Table XIV

Elementary rate constants in the mechanism of ozonolysis of 1,2-dichloroethylene at 23°C[a]

Rate Constant	cis-Isomer	trans-Isomer	Units
k_{107}	22	148	$M^{-1}sec^{-1}$
k_{108}/k_{-107}	4.6×10^4	4.6×10^4	M^{-1}
k_{109}/k_{-107}	3.2×10^4	3.2×10^4	M^{-1}
k_{111a}/k_{111b}	3.0	1.0	None
k_{112}/k_{111}	~ 2	~ 2	None

a) From Blume et al (71).

C_2Cl_4(5), CH_2CCl_2(70), cis and trans-CHClCHCl(71), and CH_2CHCl(94). This inhibition has been reported now even for CH_2CH_2(73,83). Oxygen inhibition was not reported in the ozonolysis of C_2F_4(68), but in this case the oxygen is a reaction product and the $[O_3]_0 > [C_2F_4]$ condition used in the gas phase study would have made it difficult to observe this inhibition, since molecular O_2 was not added deliberately. Thus, it appears that oxygen inhibition may be a general characteristic of the haloethylene ozonolysis reactions, and it may be so even in the ozonolysis of other simple olefins. The mechanisms of these reactions, therefore, presumably is a free radical type each involving a biradical species.

The second significant characteristic of the ozonolysis reactions reviewed here concerns the origin of the biradical species which caused the oxygen inhibition described above. In the low temperature infrared study of the ozonolysis of CH_2CH_2(88), both the primary and secondary ozonides were detected. Thus, the reaction in this case may be considered to proceed by the Criegee type mechanism where the primary ozonide is the source of the biradical species. The infrared study of the low-temperature ozonolysis of CH_2CCl_2 and CHClCHCl(92), on the other hand, showed no formation of primary ozonides even though the reactions were taking place as evidenced by the appearance of the infrared bands of phosgene and formyl chloride, respectively. The source of the biradicals for these reactions must, therefore, be other than the primary ozonides. In the case of the low-temperature ozonolysis of CH_2CHCl(92), the formation of both formyl chloride and the primary ozonide was observed in a temperature range where the decomposition rate of the latter was negligible. Thus, two independent reaction paths appear to be available here, one involving the primary ozonide and the other channel by-passing this intermediate. These spectroscopic observations indicate, in fact, that the parallel path reaction mechanism proposed by Williamson and Cvetanović (69)

consisting of reaction steps 89-91 may be correct in principle and, furthermore, it can now be modified to be consistent with the experimental observations.

For a general olefin RR' the Criegee path of biradical formation is given by reactions 113 and 114. Reaction 113 is irreversible and

Criegee Path

$$RR' + O_3 \rightarrow \overline{RR'OOO} \qquad 113$$

$$\overline{RR'OOO} \rightarrow RO_2 + R'O \qquad 114a$$

$$\rightarrow R'O_2 + RO \qquad 114b$$

$$\overline{RR'OOO} \rightarrow \text{Other products} \qquad 115$$

leads to the primary ozonide which provides the biradical RO_2 and $R'O_2$, in case of an unsymmetrical olefin. In addition the trioxolane opens and decomposes to other mono free-radical and molecular products as proposed by O'Neal and Blumstein (97). The second reaction channel, which we shall call the π-complex path of biradical formation, is based primarily on the requirements provided by the kinetic study of cis and trans-CHClCHCl. This scheme consists

π-Complex Path

$$RR' + O_3 \rightleftarrows RR'O_3 \qquad 107'$$

$$RR'O_3 + RR' \rightleftarrows R_2R_2'O_3 \qquad 108'$$

$$R_2R_2'O_3 + O_3 \rightarrow 2R'O + 2RO_2 \qquad 109a'$$

$$\rightarrow 2RO + 2R'O_2 \qquad 109b'$$

of two reversible reactions 107' and 108' followed by an irreversible step 109'. The products of reaction 107' may be the π-complexes which have been observed with many olefins at low temperatures (88,92). According to the low temperature studies with cis- or trans-CHClCHCl, the reverse of reaction 107' does not involve an isomerization but the reverse of reaction 108' may (92). Both the π-complex and Criegee paths may be important in the ozonolysis of CH_2CHCl, but for the other chloroethylenes only the

π-complex appears necessary to account for the experimental observations.

Thus we see that the O_3 reactions proceed primarily by different paths for different ethylenes, similar to the observation for O-atom reactions. Earlier in this review we showed that there are three classes of O-atom reactions, one for C_2H_4 and CH_2CHCl, one for the fluoroethylenes except CF_2CCl_2, and one for the other chloroethylenes including CF_2CCl_2.

Likewise we find here that C_2H_4, CH_2CHCl (and the higher unhalogenated olefins) form molozonides which decompose by the Criegee mechanism to give a rate law first-order in both olefin and O_3 over the entire pressure range. On the other hand, the higher chloroethylenes do not form molozonides and react with O_3 by a complex rate law which deviates from second order (first order in each reactant) at low reactant pressures, indicating reversibility of the initial reaction step. Furthermore CHClCHCl undergoes geometrical isomerization, whereas the 2-butenes do not.

It is not clear from the data whether C_2F_4 ozonolysis fits into one of these reaction classes or proceeds by a third scheme, as in O-atom attack on C_2F_4. No deviation was observed in the second-order rate law over the range studied, but, by analogy with C_4F_8-2 which did show the deviation, Heicklen (68) interpreted his data in terms of a changing rate law. However Heicklen believed that no CF_2O_2 diradicals were present because no $\overline{CF_2CF_2O}$ was observed as a product in the room-temperature gas-phase ozonolysis, yet $\overline{CF_2CF_2O}$ was a product when CF_2O_2 was produced in the C_2F_4-O_2-O system (46,67). If Heicklen's inference is correct then the ozonolysis of C_2F_4 must be different than that for either the olefins or the chloroethylenes. One note of caution in this inference is that CF_2OO may exist as either a triplet or singlet species, which may react differently. Thus the triplet CF_2OO (presumably produced in the O-O_2-C_2F_4 system) might lead to $\overline{CF_2CF_2O}$, whereas the singlet CF_2OO (as expected in the O_3-C_2F_4 system) might not

lead to $\overbrace{CF_2CF_2O}$. However if CF_2OO is not produced the π-complex mechanism might still explain the results by adding the reaction

$$R_2R_2'O_3 + O_3 \rightarrow 2RO + 2R'O + 2O_2 \qquad 109c'$$

Once the diradical RO_2 (or $R'O_2$) is produced, it can participate in a chain process, an example of which is given by reaction 110' through 119.

Chain Propagation and Termination

$$RO_2 + RR' \rightarrow R_2R'O_2 \qquad 110'$$

$$RO_2 + O_3 \rightarrow RO + 2O_2 \qquad 116$$

$$R_2R'O_2 \rightarrow RO + RR'O \qquad 117$$

$$R_2R'O_2 + O_3 \rightarrow R_2R'O_5 \qquad 111a'$$

$$\rightarrow 2RO + R'O + O_2 \qquad 111b'$$

$$R_2R'O_5 + RR' \rightarrow R_3R_2'O_5 \qquad 118a$$

$$\rightarrow RR'O + RO + R'O + RO_2 \qquad 118b$$

$$R_3R_2'O_5 + O_3 \rightarrow 2RO + 2R'O + O_2 + RO_2 \qquad 119$$

Here, RO and R'O are the carbonyl products while RR'O may be an epoxide or a rearranged product such as an acid chloride. The biradical chain carrier is RO_2 but the oxygen inhibition of the rate is represented by reactions 112', 120, and 121.

Oxygen Inhibition

$$R_2R'O_2 + O_2 \rightarrow R_2R'O_4 \qquad 112'$$

$$R_2R'O_4 + O_3 \rightarrow 2RO + R'O + 2O_2 \qquad 120$$

$$R_2R'O_4 + RR' \rightarrow RR'O + 2RO + R'O \qquad 121$$

For the chloroethylenes the mechanism consisting of reactions 107', 108', 109a', 109b', 110', 116, 117, 111a', 111b', and 112' leads to the generalized rate law

$$\frac{-d[RR']}{dt} = \left(\frac{2\alpha k_{107'}k_{108'}[O_3][RR']^2}{k_{-107'} + k_{108'}\alpha[RR']}\right)\left(1 + \frac{k_{110'}[RR']}{\beta k_{110'}[RR'] + k_{116}[O_2]}\right) \qquad \text{XXXV}$$

except for stoichiometric factors which depend on the fates of $R_2R'O_3$ (reactions 118 and 119) and $R_2R'O_4$ (reactions 120 and 121). In eqn. XXXV, the quantities α and β are defined by

$$\alpha \equiv (k_{109a'} + k_{109b'})[O_3]/(k_{-108'} + (k_{109a'} + k_{109b'})[O_3])$$

$$1-\beta \equiv k_{111a'}[O_3]/(k_{111'}[O_3] + k_{112'}[O_2] + k_{117})$$

The rate law, eqn. XXXV, is adequate to give calculated rate equations which are consistent with the experimental equations. For example, the gas phase ozonolysis of C_2F_4 can be interpreted on the basis of the π-complex path. Since the reaction products were O_2 and CF_2O, reaction 109c' can replace reactions 109a' and 109b' to obtain for the rate of formation of CF_2O

$$R\{CF_2O\} = \frac{4k_{107'}k_{108'}[O_3][C_2F_4]^2}{k_{-107'} + k_{108'}[C_2F_4]} \qquad \text{XXXVI}$$

which is independent of oxygen pressure. In the case of C_2Cl_4, the assumption of long chains with k_{117} and $k_{111b'}$ considered small compared to $k_{111a'}$, the rate laws in the absence of O_2 become

$$R_i\{CCl_2O\} = \frac{k_{107'}k_{110'}}{k_{116}}\left(1 + \frac{k_{118a}}{k_{118}}\right)[C_2Cl_4]^2 \qquad \text{XXXVII}$$

$$R_i\{C_2Cl_4O\} = \frac{2k_{107'}k_{110'}k_{118b}}{k_{116}k_{118}}[C_2Cl_4]^2 \qquad \text{XXXVIII}$$

where C_2Cl_4O includes both $\overline{CCl_2CCl_2O}$ and $CCl_3CCl(O)$, and in the presence of O_2

$$R_i\{CCl_2O\} = 8k_{107'}[C_2Cl_4][O_3] \qquad \text{XXXIX}$$

Similarly, a long-chain process for the ozonolysis of CHClCHCl gives

$$-d[O_3]/dt = -d[CHClCHCl]/dt = d[HCClO]/2dt =$$

$$\frac{4k_{107'}k_{108'}k_{109'}[CHClCHCl]^2[O_3]^2}{k_{-107'}(k_{-108'} + k_{109'}[O_3]) + k_{108'}k_{109'}[CHClCHCl][O_3]}\left\{\frac{k_{111'}[O_3] + k_{112'}[O_2]}{k_{111b'}[O_3] + k_{112'}[O_2]}\right\} \qquad \text{XL}$$

where in eqn. XL reaction 109c' is assumed to be negligible.

For the unsymmetrical olefin CH_2CCl_2 the chain carrier was deduced to be CCl_2OO rather than CH_2OO. Furthermore, no formaldehyde was observed as a product of the ozonolysis, so reaction 122

$$R'O + O_3 \rightarrow HCOOH \text{ (or } CO + H_2O) + O_2 \qquad 122$$

must be included in the general mechanism. The use of steady state approximations on the various intermediates including R'O and the assumption of long chains lead to the following rate equations.

$$\frac{-d[O_3]}{dt} = \frac{2k_{107}'[CH_2CCl_2][O_3]}{k_{117} + k_{112}'[O_2]} \{2k_{111a}'[O_3](1 + \frac{k_{118a}}{k_{118}}) + 3k_{112}'[O_2]\} \qquad \text{XLI}$$

$$\frac{-d[CH_2CCl_2]}{dt} = \frac{2k_{107}'[CH_2CCl_2][O_3]}{k_{117} + k_{112}'[O_2]} \{2k_{111a}'[O_3] + 3k_{112}'[O_2]\} \qquad \text{XLII}$$

$$\frac{d[CCl_2O]}{dt} = \frac{2k_{107}'[CH_2CCl_2][O_3]}{k_{117} + k_{112}'[O_2]} \{\frac{k_{111a}'k_{118b}}{k_{118}}[O_3] + k_{112}'[O_2]\} \qquad \text{XLIII}$$

II. OXIDATION OF CHLOROMETHANES

EXPERIMENTAL

Mixtures of perhalomethane with O_2 or O_3 or both were irradiated in a cylindrical quartz reaction cell 10 cm long and 5 cm in diameter. The cell was attached to a conventional Hg-free glass vacuum line equipped with Teflon stopcocks with Viton "O" rings. Extra dry grade O_2 from the Matheson Co. was used without further purification. The O_3 was prepared from a Tesla coil discharge through O_2 and was distilled at 87°K before use. The CCl_4 was "Baker Analyzed" reagent and was purified by distillation from a trap maintained at 210° to one at 177°K. The $CFCl_3$, CF_2Cl_2, CF_3Cl, N_2O, and CO_2 were obtained from the Matheson Co. and were purified by degassing at 77°K. In few experiments the CF_2Cl_2 was purified by distillation from a trap maintained at 87°K to one at 153°K. The perhalomethane pressure was measured with an H_2SO_4 manometer, and the O_2, CO_2, and N_2O pressures were measured with an alphatron gauge calibrated against an H_2SO_4 manometer. The O_3 pressure was measured spectrophotometrically at 253.7 nm and could be monitored continuously.

The 213.9 nm radiation for the photolysis of the perhalomethanes was provided by a Phillips (93109E) low-pressure zinc resonance lamp. For the $O(^1D)$-atom study, the 253.7 nm radiation was obtained from a Hanovia "spiral" low pressure Hg resonance lamp. The 253.7 nm line was isolated by passing the radiation through Cl_2 gas and a Corning CS 7-54 filter before entering the reaction cell.

For the CCl_4 system actinometry at both wavelengths was done by measuring H_2 production from HBr photolysis where the quantum yield of H_2 production, $\Phi\{H_2\}$, is 1.0 (107). For the chlorofluoromethanes, the

actinometry for the photolysis experiments at 213.9 nm was done by measuring the rate of N_2 production from N_2O photolysis. For this system $\Phi\{N_2\} = 1.41$ (108). The actinometry at 253.7 nm was done by either measuring the O_3 removal in pure O_3[$-\Phi\{O_3\} = 5.5$ (109)], or by measuring $\Phi\{N_2\}$ in the photolysis of O_3 in the presence of excess N_2O. For the latter system $\Phi\{N_2\} = 0.46$ for thermally equilibrated $O(^1D)$ atoms and $\Phi\{N_2\} = 0.41$ for $O(^1D)$ atoms possessing excess translational energy (108).

Analysis for $COCl_2$ was performed mainly by gas chromatography and in a few experiments by infrared analysis. Chromatography was done with a stainless steel column 10' x 1/4" containing 10% silicone oil (SP2100) on 80/100 mesh Supelcoport (Supelco Inc., Bellefonte, Pa.). Analysis for Cl_2 was made in the photolysis experiments by chromatography in the same column as for $COCl_2$ and by ultraviolet absorption spectroscopy in a Cary 14 spectrometer. For the $O(^1D)$ experiments the analysis for Cl_2 was made with a dual beam spectrophotometer (110) at 366.0 nm in order to obtain greater sensitivity. It was assumed that the increase in absorption at 366.0 nm was due entirely to Cl_2. For CO analysis the column used was 10' x 1/4" containing 5Å molecular sieves. For C_2Cl_6 analysis a flame ionization chromatograph was used equipped with a 10' x 1/4" column containing 3% SE 30 on Supelcoport.

Analysis for CFClO and CF_2O was made with a thermal conductivity gas chromatograph equipped with a copper column (10' x 1/4") containing silica gel. On this column the CFClO and CF_2O are quantitatively converted to CO_2, (2), and it is actually the yield of CO_2 that is measured. For N_2 analysis the column used was a 20' x 1/4" column containing 5Å molecular sieves. Analysis for Cl_2 was made by UV absorption with a Cary 14 spectrophotometer.

For the chlorine-atom initiated oxidations the experimental procedure was exactly the same as that described for the chloroethylenes. The CH_2Cl_2 was Eastman Kodak Spectro ACS grade, and the fraction volatile at -80° but condensable at -130° was used. The CH_3Cl was from the Matheson Co. and the fraction volatile at -80° but condensable at -196° was used.

PHOTOOXIDATION OF THE PERHALOMETHANES

Photolysis of CCl_4:

When CCl_4 is photolyzed at 25°C with 213.9 nm radiation in either the presence of O_2 or O_3 the products are CCl_2O, Cl_2, and an unidentified compound (111). At low total pressure, $\Phi\{CCl_2O\} = 2.0$, but this value drops to 1.0 for $[CCl_4] \sim 50$ Torr and $[O_2]$ or $[N_2] = 700$ Torr as shown in Fig. 14. $\Phi\{Cl_2\}$ is reasonably invariant to pressure at ~ 1.3-1.4. The results are interpreted in terms of an excited molecule mechanism which proceeds entirely by

$$CCl_4^* \rightarrow CCl_2 + Cl_2 \qquad 123$$

at low pressures, with singlet CCl_2 being produced. At higher pressures CCl_4^* is quenched and CCl_2 production is inhibited, though it may be (and probably is) replaced by production of $CCl_3 + Cl$.

At low pressures the photolysis data for CCl_4 in the presence of O_2 are consistent with the scheme:

$$CCl_4 + h\nu\ (213.9\ nm) \rightarrow CCl_2 + Cl_2 \qquad 123$$

$$CCl_2 + CCl_4 \rightarrow 2CCl_3 \qquad 124$$

$$CCl_3 + O_2 \rightarrow CCl_3O_2 \qquad 125$$

$$2CCl_3O_2 \rightarrow CCl_3O + O_2 \qquad 126$$

$$CCl_3O \rightarrow CCl_2O + Cl \qquad 127$$

$$Cl \rightarrow (1/2)Cl_2 \qquad 128$$



Figure 14: Plot of $\Phi\{COCl_2\}$ vs $[N_2]$ or $[O_2]$ for CCl_4 photolysis at 213.9 nm in the presence of O_2 or O_3 at 25°C. ○ $[CCl_4] \sim 10$ Torr in the presence of O_2, △ $[CCl_4] \sim 10$ Torr in the presence of O_3, ● $[CCl_4] \sim 50$ Torr in the presence of O_2, ▲ $[CCl_4] \sim 50$ Torr in the presence of O_3. All analyses by gas chromatography. From Jayanty et al (111).

In the presence of O_3 reactions 125, 126, and 128 must be replaced by:

$$CCl_3 + O_3 \rightarrow CCl_3O + O_2 \qquad 129$$

$$Cl + O_3 \rightarrow ClO + O_2 \qquad 10$$

$$2ClO \rightarrow 2Cl + O_2 \qquad 130a$$

$$2ClO \rightarrow Cl_2 + O_2 \qquad 130b$$

Primary process 123 followed by reaction 124 is suggested because the photolysis at low pressures leads to 2 molecules of phosgene per photon absorbed and therefore 2 molecules of CCl_4 must be removed per photon. The only fragment which could decompose a second molecule of CCl_4 appears to be CCl_2. Cl, CCl_3 or any of the oxygenated radicals are unlikely to react with CCl_4.

The CCl_2 produced would be expected to be in a singlet state, from spin conservation rules. This is supported by the fact that the CCl_2 fragment does not react with O_2. Triplet CCl_2 reacts readily with O_2 to produce CO (36), but no CO was found in this system.

The fate of CCl_3 in the presence of O_2 is given by reactions 125-127 as first suggested by Huybrechts et al (13) and confirmed by Mathias et al (5). The quantum yield of phosgene in the presence of O_3 is the same as in the presence of O_2; consequently the reactions of CCl_3 with O_2 and O_3 must ultimately lead to a common precursor of $COCl_2$. Therefore reaction 129 must be the principle reaction between CCl_3 and O_3. In the presence of O_3 the Cl atoms will be removed by reaction 10, ($k_{10} = 2 \times 10^{-11}$ cm^3/sec) (112). The ClO radicals produced in reaction 10 will be removed by reactions 130a or 130b, depending upon the total pressure. The bimolecular reaction of ClO radicals at low pressures ($\leq$ 8 Torr argon) is known to proceed exclusively by reaction 130a (113). At higher pressures ($\geq$ 70 Torr argon) reaction 130b is the exclusive reaction (114, 115).

In the present experiments reaction 130a could occur at the lowest pressures used ($\sim$10 Torr CCl_4), though for experiments for which CCl_4 $\sim$ 50 Torr reaction 130a is negligible. The reaction

$$ClO + O_3 \rightarrow Cl + 2O_2 \text{ or } ClO_2 + O_2 \qquad 14$$

can be neglected because it is slow.

At higher total pressures $\Phi(COCl_2)$ declines and reaches a value of about 1.0 at 600-700 Torr N_2 or O_2 and $\sim$ 50 Torr CCl_4. The data is shown graphically in Figure 14. A readily apparent explanation of this pressure effect, which is consistent with all the data, is the participation of a relatively long-lived excited state of CCl_4. Thus the following paths are possible:

$$CCl_4 + h\nu \rightarrow CCl_4^*$$

$$CCl_4^* + \underset{\sim}{M} \rightarrow CCl_4$$

$$CCl_4^* \rightarrow CCl_2 + Cl_2$$

or

$$CCl_4^* + M \rightarrow CCl_4^{**}$$

$$CCl_4^* \rightarrow CCl_2 + Cl_2$$

$$CCl_4^{**} \rightarrow CCl_3 + Cl$$

where * and ** are excited states of CCl_4 and these could be different electronic states, or the same electronic state with different vibrational energies.

The difficulty of postulating a long lived excited state for CCl_4 is that spectral studies of other halomethanes suggest that the broad band observed from about 160-250 nm can be attributed to a $n\text{-}\sigma^*$ transition which is not likely to lead to a stable excited state (116, 117). However, the fact that the primary process appears to be molecular Cl_2 elimination implies that the transition does not lead to a simple repulsive potential curve along the C-Cl bond reaction coordinate, but must

involve considerable electronic rearrangement.

The most reasonable explanation of the pressure effect would be:

$$CCl_2 + CCl_4 \rightarrow C_2Cl_6^*$$

$$C_2Cl_6^* \rightarrow 2CCl_3$$

$$C_2Cl_6^* + M \rightarrow C_2Cl_6$$

but a careful search for C_2Cl_6 production was negative. The failure to stabilize C_2Cl_6 (providing it is formed) even at 1 atm. O_2 or N_2 is not impossible since the A factor for C_2Cl_6 decomposition is very large ($10^{17.7}$ sec^{-1}) (118). Furthermore primary process 1 is exothermic by ~ 50 kcal/mol at 213.9 nm, and the CCl_2 may be produced with excess energy.

In the mechanism, we have neglected the reaction of CCl_2 with O_2 at high O_2 pressures, because addition of O_2 has the same effect as the addition of N_2. Consequently the reaction of CCl_2 with O_2 cannot compete with reaction 124; the rate coefficient is $\leq 10^{-13}$ cm^3/sec, and CCl_2 cannot be in its triplet state.

The first of the excited-state mechanisms predicts that $\Phi\{COCl_2\} = \Phi\{Cl_2\}$ goes from 2 → 0 as [M] goes from 0 → ∞; whereas the second mechanism predicts that $\Phi\{COCl_2\} = \Phi\{Cl_2\}$ goes from 2 → 1 as [M] goes from 0 → ∞. The highest total pressures used were not sufficiently high to determine if the quantum yields of $COCl_2$ drop below 1. Thus if either of the two mechanisms is operative the present data cannot distinguisn between them. However, since at longer wavelengths the primary process

$$CCl_4 + h\nu\ (\sim 250\ nm) \rightarrow CCl_3 + Cl \qquad 123'$$

becomes dominant, (119, 120) the second mechanism is more attractive, because it provides for the formation of $CCl_3 + Cl$ within the same

electronic transition; * and ** now would refer to different vibrational levels of the same electronic state.

The Cl_2 quantum yield is substantially below 2 (1.2 - 1.4) at low pressures and is insensitive to total pressure, contrary to expectation. The reason for this is not known, but stable oxides of chlorine may have been formed which were not detected. The previously mentioned product observed in the U.V. spectrum of the reaction mixture does not correspond to that of any of the known chlorine oxides. Both mechanisms predict that in the presence of O_3 at low pressures $-\phi\{O_3\}$ should be 4 and decline to either 3 or zero as $M \to \infty$. The data for O_3 is very limited, but it does show a slight downward trend with increasing pressure.

The present results can be compared to the only other study of CCl_4 photolysis at shorter wavelengths by Davis et al (120). This group studied the photolysis at 253.7, 184.9, 147.0 and 106.7 nm. In that study, using Br_2 scavenging experiments, it was concluded that at 253.7 nm the dominant primary process is

$$CCl_4 + h\nu\ (253.7\ nm) \rightarrow CCl_3 + Cl \qquad 123'$$

in agreement with other studies (119). However at 184.9 nm process 123 becomes important with $\phi\{123\} = 0.6$ and $\phi\{123'\} = 0.4$. From the large amounts of Br_2 necessary to scavenge the CCl_2 radicals it was concluded that reaction 124 is very efficient, though no direct evidence for reaction 124 was presented. C_2Cl_6 formation via reaction 124 was suggested but its presence was not determined.

The present results show that $\phi\{123\} = 1$ and $\phi\{123'\} \sim 0$ at low pressures. These results are not necessarily in conflict with those of Davis et al if an excited state mechanism is operative, according to which the relative importance of process 123 and 123' could vary with conditions.

The production of carbene in the photolysis of CCl_4 is not unique for halomethanes. The photolysis of CH_2I_2 (121), CF_2Br_2 and CF_2HBr (122) have been shown to undergo molecular elimination reactions at around 200 nm.

Photolysis of $CFCl_3$

Very few studies of the photolysis of the chlorofluoromethanes have been reported in the literature. Marsh and Heicklen (123) studied the photolysis of $CFCl_3$ at 213.9 nm in the presence of NO and O_2 scavengers and concluded that chlorine-atom ejection occurred with a quantum efficiency of 1.0.

In our studies (124), the photolysis of $CFCl_3$ at 213.9 nm and 25°C in the presence of O_2 or O_3 gives CFClO and Cl_2 as products with $\Phi\{CFClO\} = 0.90 \pm 0.15$ and $\Phi\{Cl_2\} = 0.50 - 0.63$. In the O_3 system, $-\Phi\{O_3\}$ increases from 2.75 at high total pressures to 4.6 at low total pressures. These results support the claim of Marsh and Heicklen that the dominant photochemical process is chlorine atom ejection with a quantum efficiency near one.

The photolysis data for $CFCl_3$ in the presence of O_2 is consistent with the mechanism:

$$CFCl_3 + h\nu\ (213.9\ nm) \rightarrow CFCl_2 + Cl \qquad 131a$$

$$\rightarrow CFCl + Cl_2 \qquad 131b$$

$$CFCl_2 + O_2 \rightarrow CFCl_2O_2 \qquad 132$$

$$2CFCl_2O_2 \rightarrow 2CFCl_2O + O_2 \qquad 133$$

$$CFCl_2O \rightarrow CFClO + Cl \qquad 134$$

$$^1CFCl + CFCl_3 \rightarrow 2CFCl_2 \qquad 135$$

$$^3CFCl + O_2 \rightarrow Cl + CO + FO \qquad 136$$

$$2CFClO_2 \rightarrow 2CFClO + O_2 \qquad 137$$

$$2Cl \rightarrow Cl_2 \qquad 138$$

In the presence of O_3 reactions 132, 136, and 138 must be replaced by

$$CFCl_2 + O_3 \rightarrow CFCl_2O + O_2 \qquad 139$$

$$CFCl + O_3 \rightarrow CFClO + O_2 \qquad 140$$

$$Cl + O_3 \rightarrow ClO + O_2 \qquad 10$$

$$2ClO \rightarrow 2Cl + O_2 \qquad 130a$$

$$\rightarrow Cl_2 + O_2 \qquad 130b$$

In the mechanism the formation of F or FCl in the primary process is not considered, since the bond energy of the C-F bond is much greater than that of the C-Cl bond. Studies of other halomethanes show that for the atom elimination process the bond broken is always the weakest one (125), and for halomethanes containing more than one F atom the stable CF_2 radical is produced (117). By analogy it seems likely that, if carbene is produced from $CFCl_3$, it would be CFCl rather than CCl_2.

First let us consider the reactions of CFCl. If the singlet CFCl, ^{1}CFCl, is produced, as expected from spin conservation rules, then reaction 135 would be expected by analogy to the $^1Cl_2$-CCl_4 system (111). On the other hand, if triplet CFCl, ^{3}CFCl, is produced it reacts with O_2, but not to give CFClO (9). Thus the production of ^{1}CFCl would tend to promote CFClO production, whereas production of ^{3}CFCl would diminish CFClO production. It is possible that both spin states are produced, and their reaction processes just balance. However as we shall see the results in the presence of O_3 are inconsistent with reaction 131b being an important process.

The reaction of $CFCl_2$ with O_2 to give CFClO can proceed via the sequence of reactions 132-134 or via

$$CFCl_2 + O_2 \rightarrow CFClO + ClO$$

We favor the former path by analogy with the reaction of CCl_3 radicals with O_2 which has been shown to proceed by a sequence analogous to reactions 132-134 (5, 13). In the presence of O_2 the Cl atoms will recombine, but in the presence of O_3 they will be removed by reaction 10 ($k_{10} = 2 \times 10^{-13}$ cm^3/sec) (112). The ClO radicals produced in reaction 10 will be removed by either reactions 130a or 130b, depending upon the total pressure. The bimolecular reaction of ClO radicals at low pressures ($\leq$ 8 Torr argon) is known to proceed exclusively by reaction 130a (113). At higher pressures ($\geq$ 70 Torr argon) reaction 130b is the exclusive reaction (114, 115). In the present experiments reaction 130a could occur at the low $CFCl_3$ pressures ($\sim$ 10 Torr), but for experiments in which the $CFCl_3$ pressure is $\sim$ 50 Torr it should be negligible. The reaction

$$ClO + O_3 \rightarrow Cl + 2O_2 \text{ or } ClO_2 + O_2$$

can be neglected, because it is slow.

The mechanism in the presence of O_3 requires that $-\Phi\{O_3\} = 3$ at high pressures and $-\Phi\{O_3\} \geq 3$ at low pressures if primary process 131a is the exclusive reaction path. On the other hand if reaction 131b is the exclusive reaction path, then one of three situations must occur:

1) all the CFCl reacts with $CFCl_3$ and $-\Phi\{O_3\} \geq 4$, but $\Phi\{CFClO\}$ should be 2.0,

2) all the CFCl reacts with O_3; $\Phi\{CFClO\}$ and $-\Phi\{O_3\} = 1$,

3) the CFCl reacts with both $CFCl_3$ and O_3 (surely ^1CFCl will react with both species) and there should be a dependence of $-\Phi\{O_3\}$ and $\Phi\{CFClO\}$ on the $[CFCl_3]/[O_3]$ ratio.

The measured values of $-\Phi\{O_3\}$ range from 2.75 at high $CFCl_3$ pressures to 4.6 at low $CFCl_3$ pressures, but $\Phi\{CFClO\} = 0.90 \pm 0.15$ under all conditions. This clearly indicates that primary process 1a is

dominant and that at low total pressure (~ 10 Torr) reaction 130a is not negligible. Based on the mechanism the rate law for O_3 removal is

$$-\Phi\{O_3\} = 3 + 2k_{130a}/k_{130b}$$

Since at 10 Torr, $-\Phi\{O_3\} = 4\text{-}4.5$, then $k_{130a}/k_{130b} = 0.5\text{-}0.75$.

The present conclusion that reaction 131a is the dominant primary process is consistent with the earlier work of Marsh and Heicklen (123) who observed the formation of $CFCl_2NO$ when $CFCl_3$ was irradiated in the presence of NO indicating the formation of $CFCl_2$ radicals in the primary process.

If we ignore reaction 131b, then the mechanism requires that $\Phi\{CFClO\} = \Phi\{Cl_2\}$ in the presence of O_2 or O_3. $\Phi\{CFClO\}$ is 1 to within the experimental uncertainty, but $\Phi\{Cl_2\} < 1$. The reason for the low Cl_2 yield is not known, but perhaps other chlorine oxides are formed. The same Cl_2 deficiency was found in the CCl_4 photooxidation (111) and there was some evidence for other unidentified products in that system. In addition, $\Phi\{CFClO\}$ could be as low as 0.75, and the presence of undetected products containing carbon and chlorine is also possible.

Photolysis of CF_2Cl_2

As far as we know no photolysis studies of CF_2Cl_2 have been published, except for the qualitative observation that flash photolysis in the quartz U.V. produces a weak absorption due to the CF_2 radical (127). In our studies with CF_2Cl_2 (124), the photolysis was done at 213.9 nm only in the presence of O_2. The products were CF_2O and Cl_2 with quantum yields of 1.0 ± 0.2 and 0.52-0.66, respectively.

The photolysis of CF_2Cl_2 in the presence of O_2 can be discussed in terms of an entirely analogous mechanism to that for $CFCl_3$ (experiments in the presence of O_3 were not done, because of experimental difficulties).

The question of interest is whether primary process 131a' or 131b' or both are important.

$$CF_2Cl_2 + h\nu\ (213.9\ nm) \rightarrow CF_2Cl + Cl \qquad 131a'$$

$$\rightarrow CF_2 + Cl_2 \qquad 131b'$$

Since experiments in the presence of O_3 could not be done, our data cannot provide a definitive answer. The qualitative flash photolysis experiments of Simons and Yarwood (126) in the quartz U.V. showed a weak absorption due to CF_2 (by contrast CF_2Br produced a strong absorption); however it is not clear whether this was due to the low primary efficiency of the primary process or simply reflects the lower absorption coefficient of CF_2Cl_2. Nevertheless the participation of process 131b' to some extent is indicated.

Singlet CF_2 does not react with O_2 at room temperature (1). However it may react with CF_2Cl_2. Dependent on the fate of CF_2, $\Phi\{CF_2O\}$ could vary anywhere from 0-2. In fact $\Phi\{CF_2O\} = 1.0 \pm 0.1$ invariant to conditions, exactly as would be expected if reaction 131a' were the dominant process. Both reaction paths lead to the expectation that $\Phi\{CF_2O\} = \Phi\{Cl_2\}$. Again as was the case for $CFCl_3$, $\Phi\{Cl_2\} < \Phi\{CF_2O\}$, but the reason for this is not known.

REACTION WITH O('D) ATOMS

The only report of the O('D)-CCl_4 reaction was by Meaburn et al (127). They examined the gas-phase radiolysis of CO_2-O_2-CCl_4 mixtures and concluded that singlet oxygen atoms react with CCl_4 to give ClO radicals. In our studies (111) we found the O(^{1}D) reaction with CCl_4 at 25°C gives CCl_2O and Cl_2 as the exclusive products. The O(^{1}D) was produced from O_3 photolysis at 253.7 nm. The quantum yields are invariant to reaction conditions and are $\Phi\{CCl_2O\} = 0.87 \pm 0.2$ and

$\Phi\{Cl_2\} = 1.1 \pm 0.2$. The O_3 consumption is the same, or slightly higher than in the absence of CCl_4. The three possible reaction paths are:

$$O(^1D) + CCl_4 \rightarrow ClO + CCl_3 \qquad 141a$$

$$\rightarrow CCl_2O + Cl_2 \qquad 141b$$

$$\rightarrow O(^3P) + CCl_4 \qquad 141c$$

Reaction 141a was shown to be an important, and possibly the exclusive, path, whereas reaction 141c is unimportant and proceeds < 20% of the time. The overall reaction rate coefficient for reaction 141 was measured by studying the decrease in $\Phi\{CCl_2O\}$ in the presence of O_2. The rate coefficient for the $O(^1D)$-CCl_4 reaction relative to the $O(^1D)$-O_2 reaction was found to be 4.0 with about a ± 10% uncertainty.

The reactions of $O(^1D)$ atoms with the chlorofluoromethanes have also not been extensively studied. Clerc (128) has observed ClO production in the flash photolysis of O_3-CF_3Cl mixtures, indicating that $O(^1D)$ abstracts the Cl atom. Recently, since our work was completed, a report by Pitts et al (129) was published which gives rate coefficients for several chlorofluoromethanes, including CF_2Cl_2 and $CFCl_3$, obtained by competitive methods relative to the reaction with N_2O.

In our studies (124) on the reactions of the chlorofluoromethanes with $O(^1D)$, prepared from the photolysis of O_3 at 253.7 nm and 25°C, the same products are obtained as in the photooxidation, and with the same yields. The quantum yields of O_3 removal are 5.7 ± 1 and 6.3 ± 1, respectively for the $CFCl_3$ and CF_2Cl_2 systems. Thus the indicated dominant reaction path is chlorine atom abstraction by $O(^1D)$, with other paths ($O(^1D)$ deactivation or direct molecular formation of products) being negligible.

Rate coefficients were obtained for the $O(^1D)$ reactions with O_3, CO_2, $CFCl_3$, CF_2Cl_2, CF_3Cl, and CCl_4 relative to N_2O. The relative rate coefficients are given in Table XV. The rate coefficients were also measured for the first five gases in the presence of He to remove the excess translational energy of the $O(^1D)$ atom. Except for O_3, the same results were obtained in the presence and absence of He. However for O_3 in the presence of He, the relative rate coefficient was 1.6.

As a check on the reactivities of $O(^1D)$ with the chlorofluoromethanes, the competition of O_2, rather than N_2O, was studied in the O_3-O_2-chlorofluoromethane system (124). By monitoring O_3 decay the relative rate coefficients for $CFCl_3$, CF_2Cl_2, and CCl_4 relative to O_2 were found to be 4.04, 2.78, and 5.3 respectively. These results are consistent with those obtained from the N_2O competition.

CHLORINE-ATOM SENSITIZED OXIDATION OF CH_2Cl_2 and CH_3Cl

Mixtures of Cl_2, O_2, and either CH_2Cl_2 or CH_3Cl were irradiated at 3655Å and 32°C (22). The Cl_2 photodissociates and $CHCl_2$ or CH_2Cl radicals are produced via hydrogen abstraction from the corresponding chlorinated methane. In the CH_2Cl_2 system, there is a long chain process, the initial products are HCl, CHClO, CCl_2O, and possibly CO. $\Phi(CHClO) = 49$ and $\Phi(CCl_2O) = 4.1$ independent of CH_2Cl_2 or O_2 pressure or I_a.

The main chain sequence appears to be analogous to that for CCl_3 oxidation

$$Cl_2 + h\nu \rightarrow 2Cl \qquad 1$$

$$Cl + CH_2Cl_2 \rightarrow CHCl_2 + HCl \qquad 143$$

$$CHCl_2 + O_2 \rightarrow CHCl_2O_2 \qquad 144$$

$$2CHCl_2O_2 \rightarrow 2CHCl_2O + O_2 \qquad 145a$$

Table XV

Summary of measured and literature values of the rate coefficient for $O(^1D)$ reactions, k{X}, relative to that for N_2O, k{N_2O}

X	He, Torr	k{X}/k{N_2O} This work	k{X}/k{N_2O} Literature
O_3	-	2.5	2-3 (109); 2.6 (130); 2.2 (131)
O_3	400-500	1.6	-
CO_2	-	0.65	0.82 (131); 0.55 (132); 0.80 (133)
CO_2	400	0.65	-
$CFCl_3$	-	1.5	2.6 ± 0.5 (129)
$CFCl_3$	400-550	1.5	-
CF_2Cl_2	-	1.2	2.4 ± 0.5 (129)
CF_2Cl_2	72-420	~1.4	-
CF_3Cl	-	0.52	-
CF_3Cl	500	0.52[a]	-
CCl_4	-	2.1	-

a) Based on one point.

$$CHCl_2O \rightarrow CHClO + Cl \qquad 146$$

The two features that are not obvious are (1) how is CCl_2O produced? and (2) how are the chains terminated?

The reactions of termination must involve two radicals. One of these cannot be $CHCl_2O$, for then there would be an intensity dependence on the quantum yield. Thus we propose

$$2CHCl_2O_2 \rightarrow (CHCl_2O)_2 + O_2 \qquad 145b$$

$$(CHCl_2O)_2 \rightarrow CHClO + CCl_2O + HCl \qquad 147a$$

$$\rightarrow CCl_2O + H_2O + CCl_2 \qquad 147b$$

where reaction 147a produces CCl_2O by termination, but reaction 147b gives CCl_2O by chain propogation since it is known (36) that CCl_2 reacts with O_2 via

$$CCl_2 + O_2 \rightarrow ClO + ClCO \rightarrow Cl + CO \qquad 148$$

and the predominant fate of ClO is

$$2ClO \rightarrow 2Cl + O_2 \qquad 149$$

Then part of the CO would come from reaction 148 and part from CHClO decomposition.

In the CH_3Cl system, the initial products are exclusively HCl and CHClO, the quantum yield of the latter being 2.0 independent of reaction conditions. Thus in this system there is no chain at all, and the mechanism is similar to that for CH_3 oxidation, except that no alcohol is produced. In both systems the CHClO produced is removed by chlorine atom attack

$$Cl + CHClO \rightarrow HCl + ClCO \rightarrow Cl + CO \qquad 142$$

with $k_{142} = 7 \times 10^8\ M^{-1}\ sec^{-1}$.

REFERENCES

1. J. Heicklen, Adv. Photochem., 7, 57 (1969).

2. M. J. Molina and F. S. Rowland, Nature (London), 249, 810 (1974).

3. R. J. Cicerone, R. S. Stolarski, and S. Walters, Science, 185, 1165 (1974).

4. R. J. Crutzen, Geophys. Res. Lettr., 1, 205 (1974).

5. E. Mathias, E. Sanhueza, I. C. Hisatsune, and J. Heicklen, Can. J. Chem., 52, 3852 (1974).

6. E. Sanhueza and J. Heicklen, "The Chlorine-Atom Initiated and $Hg(^3P_1)$ - Photosensitized Oxidation of CH_2CCl_2," Center for Air Environment Studies Report No. 353-74, Penn State University (1974), J. Photochem., in press.

7. E. Sanhueza and J. Heicklen, "The Oxidation of cis- and trans-CHClCHCl," Center for Air Environment Studies Report No. 364-74, Penn State University (1974), Int. J. Chem. Kinetics, in press.

8. E. Sanhueza and J. Heicklen, "The Oxidation of $CHClCH_2$," Center for Air Environment Studies Report No. 371-74, Penn State University (1974), J. Phys. Chem., in press.

9. E. Sanhueza and J. Heicklen, "The Oxidation of CFClCFCl and CF_2CCl_2," Center for Air Environment Studies Report No. 365-74, Penn State University (1974), Int. J. Chem. Kinetics, in press.

10. R. G. Dickinson and J. A. Leermakers, J. Am. Chem. Soc., 54, 3852 (1932).

11. R. G. Dickinson and J. L. Carrico, J. Am. Chem. Soc., 56, 1473 (1934).

12. C. Schott and H. J. Schumacher, Z. Physik. Chem., B49, 107 (1941).

13. G. Huybrechts, J. Olbregts, and K. Thomas, Trans. Farad. Soc., 63, 1647 (1967).

14. K. L. Müller and H. J. Schumacher, Z. Physik. Chem., B37, 365 (1937).

15. G. Huybrechts and L. Meyers, Trans. Farad. Soc., 62, 2191 (1966).

16. L. Bertrand, J. A. Franklin, P. Goldfinger, and G. Huybrechts, J. Phys. Chem., 72, 3926 (1968).

17. K. L. Müller and H. J. Schumacher, Z. Physik. Chem., B35, 455 (1937).

18. E. Sanhueza, unpublished results, Penn State University (1974).

19. G. Huybrechts, G. Martens, L. Meyers, J. Olbregts, and K. Thomas, Trans. Farad. Soc., 61, 1921 (1965).

20. H. J. Schumacher and H. Thürauf, Z. Phys. Chem., A189, 183 (1941).

21. R. T. Watson, Chemical Kinetics Information Center, National Bureau of Standards, Report No. NBSIR 74-516 (1974), "Chemical Kinetics Data Survey VIII. Rate Constants of ClO_x of Atmospheric Interest."

22. E. Sanhueza and J. Heicklen, J. Phys. Chem., 79, 7 (1975).

23. J. A. Franklin, G. Huybrechts, and C. Cillien, Trans. Farad. Soc., 65, 2094 (1969).

24. L. Bertrand, L. Exsteen-Meyers, J. A. Franklin, G. Huybrechts, and J. Olbregts, Int. J. Chem. Kinetics, 3, 89 (1971).

25. P. Goldfinger, G. Huybrechts, G. Martens, L. Meyers, and J. Olbregts, Trans. Farad. Soc., 61, 1933 (1965).

26. W. T. Miller, Jr. and A. L. Dittman, J. Am. Chem. Soc., 78, 2793 (1956).

27. E. Sanhueza and J. Heicklen, Can. J. Chem., 52, 3863 (1974).

28. E. Sanhueza and J. Heicklen, "The Hg $6(^3P)$ Photosensitized Oxidation of $C_2Cl_4H_2$," Center for Air Environment Studies Report No. 321-73, Penn State University (1973).

29. R. J. Cvetanović, Prog. React. Kinetics, 2, 39 (1964).

30. a) O. P. Strausz, R. J. Norstrom, D. Salahub, R. K. Gosani, H. E. Gunning, and I. G. Csizmadia, J. Am. Chem. Soc., 92, 6395 (1970); b) O. P. Strausz, private communication (1974).

31. B. Atkinson, Nature, 163, 291 (1949).

32. B. Atkinson, J. Chem. Soc., 1952, 2685.

33. J. Heicklen, V. Knight, and S. A. Greene, J. Chem. Phys., 42, 221 (1965).

34. J. Heicklen and V. Knight, J. Phys. Chem., 70, 3901 (1966).

35. J. Heicklen, J. Phys. Chem., 70, 618 (1966).

36. E. Sanhueza and J. Heicklen, Can. J. Chem., 52, 3870 (1974).

37. E. Sanhueza and J. Heicklen, Int. J. Chem. Kinetics, 6, 553 (1974).

38. E. Sanhueza and J. Heicklen, "The Reaction of $O(^1P)$ with CCl_2CH_2," Center for Air Environment Studies Report No. 360-74, Penn State University (1974), J. Photochem., in press.

39. R. J. Cvetanović, Adv. Photochem., 1, 115 (1963).

40. S.-I. Hirokami and R. J. Cvetanović, Can. J. Chem., 51, 373 (1973).

41. R. J. Cvetanović, Can. J. Chem., 33, 1684 (1955).

42. R. J. Cvetanović, J. Chem. Phys., 23, 1375 (1955).

43. J. R. Kanofsky and D. Gutman, Chem. Phys. Lettr., 15, 236 (1972).

44. F. J. Pruss, Jr., I. R. Slagle, and D. Gutman, J. Phys. Chem., 78, 663 (1974).

45. I. R. Slagle, D. Gutman, and J. R. Gilbert, Chem. Phys. Lettr., 26, 111 (1974).

46. D. Saunders and J. Heicklen, J. Am. Chem. Soc., 87, 2088 (1965).

47. R. C. Mitchell and J. P. Simons, J. Chem. Soc., (B) 1968, 1005.

48. R. E. Huie, J. T. Herron and D. D. Davis, Int. J. Chem. Kinetics, 4, 521 (1972).

49. S. J. Moss, Trans. Farad. Soc., 67, 3503 (1971).

50. W. J. R. Tyerman, Trans. Farad. Soc., 65, 163 (1969).

51. R. N. Haszeldine and B. R. Steele, J. Chem. Soc., 1954, 3447.

52. D. P. Johari, H. W. Sidebottom, J. M. Tedder, and J. C. Walton, J. Chem. Soc., (B) 1971, 95.

53. R. Atkinson and R. J. Cvetanović, J. Chem. Phys., 55, 659 (1971).

54. D. D. Davis, R. E. Huie, J. T. Herron, M. J. Kurylo, and W. Braun, J. Chem. Phys., 56, 4868 (1972).

55. F. Stuhl and H. Niki, J. Chem. Phys., 57, 5403 (1972).

56. M. J. Kurylo and R. E. Huie, J. Chem. Phys., 58, 1258 (1973).

57. I. R. Slagle, F. J. Pruss, Jr., and D. Gutman, Int. J. Chem. Kinetics, 6, 111 (1974).

58. R. Atkinson and J. N. Pitts, Jr., Chem. Phys. Lettr., 27, 467 (1974).

59. R. Atkinson and J. N. Pitts, Jr., J. Phys. Chem., 78, 1780 (1974).

60. W. A. McClenny, J. Chem. Phys., 60, 793 (1974).

61. E. A. Lissi, private communication (1973).

62. R. F. Lake and H. Thompson, Proc. Roy. Soc., A, 315, 323 (1970).

63. J. A. Kerr and M. H. Parsonage, "Evaluated Kinetic Data on Gas Phase Addition Reactions," CRC Press, Cleveland, Ohio (1972), pp. 101-102.

64. W. Kirmse, "Carbene Chemistry," Academic Press (1964), pp. 20-21.

65. D. D. Davis, J. F. Schmidt, C. M. Neeley, and R. J. Hanrahan, J. Phys. Chem., 79, 11 (1975).

66. R. J. Gordon and M. C. Lin, Chem. Phys. Lettr., 22, 107 (1973).

67. J. Heicklen and V. Knight, J. Phys. Chem., 70, 3893 (1966).

68. J. Heicklen, J. Phys. Chem., 70, 477 and 4101 (1966).

69. D. G. Williamson and R. J. Cvetanović, J. Am. Chem. Soc., 90, 4248 (1968).

70. L. A. Hull, I. C. Hisatsune, and J. Heicklen, Can. J. Chem., 51, 1504, (1973).

71. C. W. Blume, I. C. Hisatsune, and J. Heicklen, "Gas Phase Ozonolysis of cis- and trans-Dichloroethylene," Center for Air Environment Studies Report No. 385-75, Penn State University (1975).

72. B. J. Finlayson, J. N. Pitts, Jr., and H. Akimoto, Chem. Phys. Lettr., 12, 495 (1972).

73. B. J. Finlayson, J. N. Pitts, Jr., and R. Atkinson, J. Am. Chem. Soc., 96, 5356 (1974).

74. R. D. Cadle and C. Schadt, J. Chem. Phys., 21, 163 (1953).

75. P. L. Hanst, E. R. Stephens, W. E. Scott, and R. C. Doerr, Am. Chem. Soc. Nat'l. Meeting, Symp. on Air Pollution Research, Division of Petroleum Chemistry (Sept., 1959).

76. T. Vrbaski and R. J. Cvetanović, Can. J. Chem., 38, 1053 (1960).

77. T. Vrbaski and R. J. Cvetanović, Can. J. Chem., 38, 1063 (1960).

78. Y. K. Wei and R. J. Cvetanović, Can. J. Chem., 41, 913 (1963).

79. J. J. Bufalini and A. P. Altshuller, Can. J. Chem., 43, 2243 (1965).

80. W. B. DeMore, Int. J. Chem. Kinetics, 1, 209 (1969).

81. R. Atkinson, B. J. Finlayson, and J. N. Pitts, Jr., J. Am. Chem. Soc., 95, 7592 (1973).

82. D. H. Stedman, C. H. Wu, and H. Niki, J. Phys. Chem., 77, 2511 (1973).

83. J. T. Herron and R. E. Huie, J. Phys. Chem., 78, 2085 (1974).

84. D. G. Williamson and R. J. Cvetanović, J. Am. Chem. Soc., 90, 3668 (1968).

85. C. W. Gillies and R. L. Kuczkowski, J. Am. Chem. Soc., 94, 6337 (1972).

86. C. W. Gillies and R. L. Kuczkowski, J. Am. Chem. Soc., 94, 7609 (1972).

87. C. W. Gillies, R. P. Lattimer, and R. L. Kuczkowski, J. Am. Chem. Soc., 96, 1536 (1974).

88. L. A. Hull, I. C. Hisatsune, and J. Heicklen, J. Am. Chem. Soc., 94, 4856 (1972).

89. L. A. Hull, I. C. Hisatsune, and J. Heicklen, J. Phys. Chem., 76, 2659 (1972).

90. D. Garvin and C. Schubert, J. Phys. Chem., 60, 807 (1956).

91. F. Gozzo and G. Camaggi, Chim. Ind., 50, 197 (1968).

92. I. C. Hisatsune, L. H. Kolopajlo, and J. Heicklen, unpublished work, Penn State University (1975).

93. I. C. Hisatsune and J. Heicklen, Can. J. Spectry., 18, 77 (1973).

94. L. H. Kolopajlo, unpublished work, Penn State University (1975).

95. R. P. Lattimer, R. L. Kuczkowski, and C. W. Gillies, J. Am. Chem. Soc., 96, 348 (1974).

96. R. Criegee and G. Werner, Justus Liebigs Ann. Chem., 546, 9 (1949).

97. H. E. O'Neal and C. Blumstein, Int. J. Chem. Kinetics, 5, 397 (1973).

98. C. E. Bishop and R. P. Story, J. Am. Chem. Soc., 90, 1905 (1968).

99. P. R. Story, C. E. Bishop, J. R. Burgess, R. W. Murray, and R. D. Youssefyeh, J. Am. Chem. Soc., 90, 1907 (1968).

100. P. R. Story, J. A. Alford, J. R. Burgess, and W. C. Ray, J. Am. Chem. Soc., 93, 3042 (1971).

101. P. R. Story, J. A. Alford, W. C. Ray, and J. R. Burgess, J. Am. Chem. Soc., 93, 3044 (1971).

102. H. Staudinger, Chem. Ber., 58, 1088 (1925).

103. P. R. Story, C. E. Bishop, J. R. Burgess, J. B. Olson, R. W. Murray, and R. D. Youssefyeh in "Oxidation of Organic Compounds, Vol. 3," Adv. Chem. Series, 77, American Chemical Society, Washington, D. C., 1968, pp. 46-57.

104. P. S. Bailey, J. W. Ward, R. E. Hornish, and F. E. Potts, III, in "Ozone Reactions with Organic Compounds," Adv. Chem. Series 112, American Chemical Society, Washington, D. C., 1972, pp. 1-8.

105. J. Carles and S. Fliszar, in "Ozone Reactions with Organic Compounds," Adv. Chem. Series 112, American Chemical Society, Washington, D. C., 1972, pp. 35-49.

106. H. Niki, E. E. Daby, and B. Weinstock in "Photochemical Smog and Ozone Reactions," Adv. Chem. Series 113, American Chemical Society, Washington, D. C., 1972, pp. 16-57.

107. G. S. Forbes, I. E. Cline, and B. C. Bradshaw, J. Am. Chem. Soc., 60, 1413 (1938).

108. R. Simonaitis, R. I. Greenberg, and J. Heicklen, Intern. J. Chem. Kinet., 4, 497 (1972).

109. E. Lissi and J. Heicklen, J. Photochem., 1, 39 (1972).

110. R. Simonaitis and J. Heicklen, J. Phys. Chem., 78, 653 (1974).

111. R. K. M. Jayanty, R. Simonaitis, and J. Heicklen, J. Photochem., in press.

112. R. T. Watson, National Bureau of Standards Report, NBSIR 74-516 "Chemical Kinetics Data Survey VIII" (1974).

113. M. A. A. Clyne and I. F. White, Trans. Farad. Soc., 67, 2068 (1971).

114. G. Porter and F. J. Wright, Disc. Farad. Soc., 14, 23 (1953).

115. N. Basco and N. K. Dogra, Proc. Roy. Soc., A323, 29, 401 (1971).

116. J. Doucet, P. Sanvegeau and C. Sandorfy, J. Chem. Phys., 58, 3708 (1973).

117. J. R. Majer and J. P. Simons, Adv. Photochem., 2, 137 (1964).

118. M. L. White and R. R. Kuntz, Intern. J. Chem. Kinet., 5, 187 (1973).

119. J. Currie, J. Sidebottom and J. Tedder, Intern. J. Chem. Kinet., 6, 481 (1974); earlier references are given in this paper.

120. D. D. Davis, J. F. Schmidt, C. Neeley and R. J. Hanrahan, J. Phys. Chem., 79, 11 (1975).

121. G. W. G. Style, and J. C. Ward, J. Chem. Soc., 2125 (1952).

122. J. R. Majer and C. R. Patrick, Nature, 192, 866 (1961).

123. D. Marsh and J. Heicklen, J. Phys. Chem., 69, 4410 (1965).

124. R. K. M. Jayanty, R. Simonaitis, and J. Heicklen, submitted for publication (1975).

125. J. N. Pitts, Jr., and J. G. Calvert, "Photochemistry" John Wiley & Sons, Inc., New York, (1967) p. 522.

126. J. P. Simons and A. J. Yarwood, Trans. Farad. Soc., 57, 2167 (1961).

127. G. M. Meaburn, D. Perner, J. LeCalvé, and M. Bourène, J. Phys. Chem., 72, 3020 (1968).

128. M. Clerc, Compt. Rend., 260, 2189 (1965).

129. J. N. Pitts, Jr., H. L. Sandoval and R. Atkinson, Chem. Phys. Letters, 29, 31 (1974).

130. C. S. Goldman, R. I. Greenberg and J. Heicklen, Intern. J. Chem. Kinet., 3, 501 (1971).

131. D. Garvin and R. F. Hampson, National Bureau of Standards Report, NBSIR 74-430 "Chemical Kinetics Data Survey VII" (1974).

132. P. M. Scott and R. J. Cvetanović, J. Chem. Phys., 54, 1440 (1970).

133. G. Paraskevopoulos, K. F. Preston and R. J. Cvetanović, J. Chem. Phys., 54, 3907 (1971).

LIST OF PUBLICATIONS

1. L. A. Hull, I. C. Hisatsune, and J. Heicklen, Can. J. Chem., 51, 1504 (1973), "The Reactions of O_3 with CCl_2CH_2."

2. E. Sanhueza and J. Heicklen, Intern. J. Chem. Kinet., 6, 553 (1974). "The Reaction of $O(^3P)$ with C_2HCl_3."

3. E. Mathias, E. Sanhueza, I. C. Hisatsune, and J. Heicklen, Canad. J. Chem., 52, 3852 (1974) "The Chlorine-Atom Sensitized Oxidation and Ozonolysis of C_2Cl_4."

4. E. Sanhueza and J. Heicklen, Canad. J. Chem., 52, 3863, "The Hg $6(^3P)$-Photosensitized Oxidation of C_2Cl_4."

5. E. Sanhueza and J. Heicklen, Canad. J. Chem., 52, 3870 (1974), "The Reaction of $O(^3P)$ with C_2Cl_4."

6. E. Sanhueza and J. Heicklen, J. Phys. Chem., 79, 7 (1975), "The Chlorine-Atom Sensitized Oxidation of CH_2Cl_2 and CH_3Cl.

7. E. Sanhueza and J. Heicklen, Intern. J. Chem. Kinet., in press, "The Oxidation of CFClCFCl and CF_2CCl_2."

8. E. Sanhueza and J. Heicklen, J. Photochem., in press, "The Reaction of $O(^3P)$ with CCl_2CH_2."

9. E. Sanhueza and J. Heicklen, J. Photochem., in press, "The Chlorine-Atom Initiated and Hg $6(^3P_1)$-Photosensitized Oxidation of CH_2CCl_2."

10. E. Sanhueza and J. Heicklen, Intern. J. Chem. Kinet., in press, "The Oxidation of cis- and trans-CHClCHCl."

11. E. Sanhueza and J. Heicklen, J. Phys. Chem., in press, "The Oxidation of C_2H_3Cl."

12. E. Sanhueza and J. Heicklen, J. Photochem., in press, "The Hg $6(^3P)$-Sensitized Photooxidation of C_2Cl_3H."

13. Cary W. Blume, I. C. Hisatsune, and J. Heicklen, "Gas Phase Ozonolysis of cis- and trans-Dichlorethylene," CAES Report No. 385-75, The Pennsylvania State University.

14. R. K. M. Jayanty, R. Simonaitis, and J. Heicklen, J. Photochem., in press (1975), "The Photolysis of CCl_4 in the Presence of O_2 or O_3 at 213.9 nm, and the Reaction of $O(^1D)$ with CCl_4."

15. R. K. M. Jayanty, R. Simonaitis, and J. Heicklen, to be published, "The Photolysis of Chlorofluoromethanes in the Presence of O_2 or O_3 at 213.9 nm and Their Reactions with $O(^1D)$."

16. I. C. Hisatsune and J. Heicklen, Canad. J. Spectry., 18, 77, (1973), "Infrared Spectrum of Formyl Chloride."

17. I. C. Hisatsune and J. Heicklen, Canad. J. Spectry., 18, 135, (1973), "Are There Two Structural Isomers of Formic Acid?"